UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMERICAN ADAPTATIONS OF FRENCH PLAYS ON THE NEW YORK AND PHILADELPHIA STAGES FROM 1790 TO 1833.

HAROLD WILLIAM SCHOENBERGER

A THESIS
IN ENGLISH

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PHILADELPHIA
1924

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

PREFACE

With two exceptions this dissertation has been limited to the plays first acted on the New York and Philadelphia stages from 1790 to 1833. J. D. Turnbull's *Rudolph; or, The Robbers of Calabria*, though first acted at the Boston Theater in 1807, has been included because it is a play of peculiar interest. M. M. Noah's *Paul and Alexis*, later known as *The Wandering Boys*, was first performed at the Charleston Theater in 1812; it owes its inclusion mainly to the fact that it is one of the first plays by an American to be performed in England after an initial performance in America. Richard Penn Smith's *The Disowned*, though first presented at the Holliday Street Theater, Baltimore, was produced by the Philadelphia Company and belongs to the annals of the Philadelphia stage. Non-extant American plays adapted from the French have not been considered, except in the case of two dramatists—Dunlap and Payne —whose other plays were under discussion. In each case the French original has been compared with the adaptation.

This study has been made possible by the very valuable Clothier Collection of American Plays in the Library of the University of Pennsylvania. Through the inter-library loan I have received substantial assistance from the university libraries of Brown, Columbia, Princeton, and Johns Hopkins. For permission to use the manuscript writings of Richard Penn Smith I am indebted to Mr. Ernest Spofford of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. But especially are my thanks due to Dr. G. H. Gerould and Mr. H. S. Leach of the Princeton Library for their ready and generous aid in putting at my disposal their recent acquisition of 10,000 French plays, which have proved invaluable to me in my investigations. To Professor A. H. Quinn, who first suggested this subject to me, I wish to express my deepest obligation for his sympathetic advice and helpful suggestions.

This study was made for the most part while the writer held the Harrison Fellowship in English on the Harrison Foundation in the University of Pennsylvania. If, therefore, it offers a small contribution to the knowledge of our early drama, it may add another testimony, however slight, to the worth of that foundation.

CONTENTS

PAGE

I

Introduction 7

II

Plays Produced from 1790 to 1812 12

III

Plays Produced from 1816 to 1828 35

IV

Plays Produced from 1829 to 1833 74

APPENDIX

A. A comparison of the *dramatis personæ* of the French originals with the American adaptations 86

B. Bibliography 93

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41542728_0034

Introduction

Though it is generally believed that the French Revolution affected only the political life of America, its influence was more extensive. In the last decade of the eighteenth century, when France, in her turn, attempted a practical assertion of democratic principles, her efforts were hailed with a lively sympathy and a whole-hearted enthusiasm in America. Among the advertisements of the booksellers in Philadelphia we find widely advertised and evidently read Mirabeau's *Speeches*, Condorcet's *Life of Turgot*, Dumouriez's *Memoirs*, and Rabaut's *History of the French Revolution*. The papers of the day contained many columns of French news.

This interest in France soon became apparent in our literature. Poems appeared with significant titles, such as "July the Fourteenth," "Man Shall Be Free," "Ode on the Death of Charlotte Corday," "Epitaph for Robespierre Whenever He Dies," "Ode to Equality," "The American's Prayer for France." Plays were written which reflected the popular feeling toward our former allies. They bore such titles as "The Demolition of the Bastile," "Tyranny Suppressed," "Liberty Restored," "Fayette in Prison, or Misfortunes of the Great."[1] In 1824, the occasion of Lafayette's last visit to America inspired two American playwrights[2] to dramatize an incident in the life of the brave Frenchman.

On every occasion Americans delighted in showing their democratic sympathies for the French people. In March, 1794 Hodgkinson, one of the most popular actors of the day, appeared on the stage of the New York Theater as Captain Flash. His English costume was the cause of violent opposition which Dunlap has thought worthy of recording. "As marking the state

---

[1] There is, however, no record of the performance of any of these plays.

[2] Walter Lee, *La Fayette; or, The Fortress of Olmutz*, Philadelphia, 1824. Samuel Woodworth, *La Fayette; or, The Castle of Olmutz*, New York, 1824. Only Woodworth's play was acted. It was performed at the Park Theater, New York, February 23, 1824.

of the public mind at this time, we notice a circumstance, otherwise insignificant: Hodgkinson, when he came on the stage for Captain Flash in *Miss In Her Teens*, dressed, as the part always is, in an English uniform, was hissed and called upon by the French party, who could not look at an English officer's coat without being in a rage, to 'take it off.' He came forward, and to the satisfaction of the French partisans, said he represented a coward and a bully. Unfortunately, this was running on Charybdis to avoid Scylla, and the English partisans threatened vengeance on the actor."[3]

The sympathy for the political aspirations of the French soon assumed wider forms. For a time the imitation of French customs became an absolute fetish. The folly of the French dress was a source of never-ending amusement. The dress of the beau was all in the French fashion. His favorite talk was of the last French play. Indeed, this infatuation for all things French became so absurd that James N. Barker wrote a comedy[4] in which, in the character of Fluttermore, he ridiculed the prevailing weaknesses of certain young fops in their aping of French styles and manners.

Though American theater-goers had been introduced to the dramatic literature of France through occasional British adaptations, such as Hill's *Zara*, Dibdin's *Deserter*, and Philips' *Distrest Mother*, it was not until Humphreys' *Widow of Malabar* was performed in 1790 that an American rendering of a French piece appeared on the American stage. But Humphreys' translation excited no immediate interest in the French drama. A quickened interest in French pieces was not to come until the arrival of the *mélodrame* in 1803.

It was through the efforts of William Dunlap that the French drama first received serious attention on the American stage. Although Dunlap's activities as an adaptor were confined chiefly to the German plays of Kotzebue, he also drew upon France for contributions. After 1803 there is a marked decrease in the popularity of Kotzebue and the German drama. The plays

---

[3] *History of the American Theater*, p. 111.

[4] *Tears and Smiles.* First performed at the Chestnut Street Theater, Philadelphia, March 4, 1807.

founded on tales of horror and the English mystery pieces begin to crowd the German domestic dramas off the boards. France and England now supply the American stage with dramatic pieces. Dunlap adapted eight French plays, which were performed between 1797 and 1828. His most successful French adaptations proved to be the two melodramas, *The Voice of Nature* and *The Wife of Two Husbands*.

For eleven years after Dunlap's retirement from the management of the Park Theater, in 1805, only a few adaptations from the French appeared on the American stage. In 1807 was performed J. D. Turnbull's *Rudolph; or, The Robbers of Calabria*, a spectacular melodrama with all the paraphernalia of the Gothic romance. In 1812 appeared M. M. Noah's *Paul and Alexis*, later renamed *The Wandering Boys*, a melodrama of the purely sentimental type.

Beginning with 1816, when Payne's *The Maid and the Magpie* appeared at the Park Theater, New York, a decided increase is apparent in the number of French adaptations. This new interest in the French drama was due almost wholly to the tireless industry of John Howard Payne, twelve of whose adaptations were played in America between 1816 and 1826. Payne was the most prolific adaptor of French plays in the early period, and as an ingenious and capable adaptor he had no equal. His skill in adapting is attested in tragedy by his *Brutus* and in comedy by his *Charles the Second*. At least seven of his adaptations were melodramas, and all but one—*Adeline*, which has an unhappy ending—enjoyed popular successes. While Payne's adaptations were appearing in quick succession on the American boards, M. M. Noah made another contribution from the French. This was *The Grecian Captive*, a wild Oriental melodrama which reflected the contemporary interest in the struggle of the Greeks for independence. It was performed in 1822.

Richard Penn Smith followed Payne with adaptations from the French. He wrote twenty plays, at least ten of which were inspired by French models. Four of these French renderings were played on the Philadelphia stage between 1829 and 1833, and two of them were stirring melodramas.

The three principal playwrights considered in this study

were all chiefly adaptors. The genius of Dunlap, Payne, and Smith lay largely in adaptation. When not attempting original compositions, Payne and Smith confined themselves to adapting French and British pieces. Dunlap alone turned also to the German drama for inspiration.

Between 1790 and 1833 six American playwrights made adaptations from French plays which appeared on the native stage. These dramatists could read the French language with appreciation, as their translations prove. They turned to France because of a natural sympathy for the French people, and because the French pieces, especially the *mélodrames*, were exceedingly popular on the French and British stages. It was, however, the prejudice against native productions, as well as the lack of courage on the part of American managers, which was in a measure responsible for the numerous foreign adaptations.

It was in the melodrama that the French influence was most apparent on the American stage in the early period. Fully one-half of the plays considered in this study are melodramas in the French form. To be sure, there were plays which conformed to the type of melodrama long before the name was found for them; nevertheless the work of Pixerécourt and his followers established for this species of drama a more elaborate technique and more definite principles of construction than had hitherto been observed.

The melodrama, which reached its highest development in France, was not without its harmful effects upon American playwrights. It perpetuated a false sentimentality, so manifest in the domestic plays of Kotzebue whose vogue was passing as the melodrama appeared. In his analysis of the melodrama, Royer observes: "Les sentiments mis en jeu sont choisis à l'extrémité de la gamme passionnelle; ils sont outrés de couleur, de manière à violenter les regards; les moyens d'action sont tout d'une pièce, le plus souvent forcés, exagérés, d'une invraisemblance parfois choquante. Le mélodrame se permet tout, à condition d'arriver à l'effet. Ne demandez à ce genre de composition ni nuances, ni finesses, ni délicatesse de pensée

ou de langage: le public à qui on le destine ne veut que de fortes émotions, et il les veut à tout prix."[5]

But the greatest weakness of the melodrama lay in its insufficiency of psychological analysis, which was due in part to the rise of democratic ideas. Profound or adequate characterization and the truth of the sentiments expressed were not considered matters of first importance by the exponents of this *genre*. Everything was subordinated to effect, in the achievement of which the most startling absurdities and the wildest improbabilities were allowed. The ballet and the fête were introduced. An elaborate stage machinery was devised, and the musician and the decorator became valuable auxiliaries in the production of effects. The melodrama is, however, intimately connected with the history of the time which produced it. The present generation which may affect to scorn it, applauds it in many successes of the day without perceiving that it has merely improved its style and changed its name.

But the melodrama was not without the merits of some of its defects. It played no insignificant part in preparing the way for the romantic drama. In its blending of comedy with tragedy, and in its use of prose as a medium for dramatic expression it broke with the classic tradition of the preceding century. The elaborate *mise en scène* and the general freedom from restraint, two striking characteristics of the melodrama, are reflected in the romantic school which followed.

---

[5] *Histoire Universelle du Théâtre*, Vol. 5, p. 351.

II

Plays Produced from 1790 to 1812

The Widow of Malabar; or, The Tyranny of Custom, by David Humphreys, was the first American adaptation of a French play for the American stage.[1] David Humphreys, a colonel in the Continental Army and a valued friend of Washington, went abroad in 1784 with a commission, which included Jefferson, Adams, and Franklin, to negotiate treaties of commerce with foreign powers. He lived in Paris and London until 1786. It is quite possible that while in Paris at this time Humphreys saw a representation of *La Veuve du Malabar ou l'Empire des Coutumes*, which he translated a few years later.

La Veuve du Malabar ou l' Empire des Coutumes, a tragedy in five acts by Lemierre, was first played in Paris in 1770.[2] This mediocre piece is written in French heroic verse. Its plot is based upon the actual practice of the Hindoo rite of suttee, and turns upon the attempt of the Bramin priests to sacrifice the young widow of a Bramin upon her husband's pyre.

A maritime city on the coast of Malabar is besieged by French forces and is on the point of capitulating. Within the city, on the portico of his pagod the High Priest appears and announces that Lanassa, the beautiful young widow of a Bramin, is preparing to immolate herself upon her husband's funeral pyre. A young Bramin is sent to lead the unfortunate widow to her doom. In the interview which ensues, the young Bramin discovers that Lanassa is his long-lost sister. Both believe in their relationship with little proof. In defiance of all custom, the brother now declares his intention of saving his sister from her horrible fate. Lanassa, however, appears less eager to save herself. She de pi ed her late husband and lost her only love, a French soldier who left Malabar three years before.

---

[1] In 1783 John Henry, an Englishman, made a French adaptation for the old American Company. His version, which has not survived, was entitled *The School for Soldiers; or, The Deserter* from Mercier's *Le Déserteur* (1770).

[2] "Tragédie de Lemierre, tombée en 1770, et reprise avec un éclatant succès dix ans plus tard; le décor du bûcher en constituait le principal attrait." Gaiffe, p. 212.

The French general who is besieging the city has consented to a day's truce. Wandering about the city walls, he learns that a widow is this day to be sacrificed to the religious rites of the Bramins, and he determines to stop the cruel ceremony. He enters the city to plead with the Bramin priests, but to no avail. The High Priest then breaks his word and orders an attack upon the French.

Informed that the French general has been killed in the attack, the High Priest of the Bramins orders the funeral rites to proceed without delay. Lanassa is led to the dreaded pyre. Apparently nothing can save her, when lo! the French general arrives with reinforcements and rescues her. In the meantime he has learned that the fair widow is the woman with whom he shared a mutual affection on his last visit to Malabar and before her marriage to the Bramin. The "tragedy" ends happily.

In naming his play a French imitation Humphreys is guilty of understatement. *The Widow of Malabar* is a faithful, though neither slavish nor wholly literal, translation of the French play, and it retains in large measure the spirit of the original. With good dramatic sense Humphreys breaks down the longer speeches, which were, however, less objectionable to the Gallic mind. In several scenes the American adaptor employs a more vivid phrase than the Frenchman.

The Widow of Malabar; or, The Tyranny of Custom was first played at the Southwark Theater, Philadelphia, May 7, 1790, with the following cast:[3]

Lanissa, Widow of Malabar . . . . . Mrs. Henry
Fatima, Her Friend . . . . . Miss Tuke
High Priest of Bramins . . . . . Mr. Henry
Young Bramin . . . . . Mr. Harper
A Bramin . . . . . Mr. Biddle
French General . . . . . Mr. Hallam
French Officer . . . . . Mr. Wignell
An Officer of the Governo . . . . . Mr. Martin
Bramins
People
Officers and Soldiers, French

[3] For the time and place of the first performance of most of the plays treated in this study I am indebted to Professor A. H. Quinn's *A History of the American Drama.*

This translation was performed at the John Street Theater, New York, October 17, 1791. The announcement read as follows: "*The Widow of Malabar; or, The Tyranny of Custom.* A play in five acts written by a citizen of the U. S. (acted at Philadelphia and Baltimore with great applause), with a prologue by J. Trumbull, LL.D."[4]

Lemierre's play was evidently considered worthy of imitation, for Mariana Stark made a version of *La Veuve du Malabar*, which was presented at Covent Garden only two days before Humphreys' translation appeared in Philadelphia.[5] This play entitled *The Widow of Malabar, a tragedy as performed at Theatre Royal, Covent Garden*, was printed and sold by E. Story of Philadelphia in 1791.

The British adaptor has compressed the original five-act play into a three-act "tragedy." Her first act follows the text of the French piece fairly closely, though not so faithfully as does the American version. Her second and third acts depart more widely from the text of the original. The British version was made with an eye upon the native stage. It is "England's hardy sons" that bring about the rescue; it is an English, not a French, general who saves the widow; and at the end it is suggested that the "Christian Cross" be set up in Malabar. The British adaptor sometimes lengthens speeches if they can be made to redound to the praise of the English; and she also heightens the effect in the last act by showing the widow mounting the lighted pyre. In the French original and in the American translation the pyre remains unlighted.

The French and the American plays make a Frenchman the hero and make no suggestion of a new religion, but of better laws. Humphreys' play makes fewer alterations on its original and follows it more faithfully in text, scenes, and situations than does the British version; its blank verse is also of a better quality.

Humphreys' adaptation contains an epilogue written in America and spoken by Mrs. Henry. It is a rather odd fact

---

[4] Wegelin, p. 49.

[5] Genest records it as "an interesting piece taken from the French—the principal objection to it seems to be, that the young Bramin is not a very natural character—the sentiments put into his mouth are such as are not likely to have occurred to a native of India." Vol. 6, p. 604.

that the British play, printed in Philadelphia, contains this same epilogue with the same notice, "written in America and spoken by Mrs. Henry." No doubt the American editor added this epilogue and its inscription to the British version, which was printed just one year after Humphreys' play.

The first adaptation from the French on the American stage set no new fashion and apparently aroused no interest in the contemporary productions of the French stage. Humphreys was a dilettante in letters and may have undertaken the translation of Lemierre's tragedy as a mere literary exercise, though, we may be sure, he was flattered to see his adaptation put upon the stage.

The French drama received its first conspicuous introduction on the American stage through the efforts of the indefatigable, if unfortunate, first American stage-manager, William Dunlap. *Tell Truth and Shame the Devil: a comedy in two acts* was first performed by the old American Company at the John Street Theater, New York, January 9, 1797. This piece, printed in the same year, was prefaced by the following note: "Those who are curious to know how far this comedy is original, or how far borrowed, will be satisfied by consulting a French dramatic proverb, of one act, called *Jerome Pointu*."

The French play[6] by A. L. B. Robineau, who wrote under the pseudonym of "Beaunoir," was represented at Paris in 1781. It has the following characters:

Jérome Pointu, Procureur.
Léandre, Maître-Clerc de M. Pointu.
Blaise, Clerc de Normandie.
Jeanette, Cuisinère de M. Pointu.
La scène est à Paris, dans la maison de M. Pointu.

In Dunlap's adaptation Jérome Pointu is renamed Semblance, Léandre becomes Tom Holton, and Jeanette becomes Susan. Blaise is omitted, and Whitely, a new character, is added.

[6] *Jérome Pointu*, comédie en un acte et en prose; représentée, pour la première fois, sur le Théâtre des Variétés Amusantes, le 13 juin 1781, et devant Leurs Majestés, le 11 septembre suivant. Paris, 1782.

Dunlap makes of this one-act *comédie* a two-act farce. He follows loosely the plot of his original and makes many minor changes. His first scene is his own invention. Here Whitely announces to Semblance, his law partner, that he can no longer connive at his shady dealings, and that he intends to sever relations with him. He accuses Semblance of being hard-hearted, avaricious, and licentious, and urges him to change his ways, at the same time advising him to allow his daughter to marry Tom Holton.

The French piece opens with the next scene. Semblance discovers his ward, Tom Holton, in the act of kissing the servant, Susan, and drives him from home. To revenge himself, Tom decides to expose the old hypocrite, his guardian. A few hours later, disguised as a captain of an English man-of-war, Tom induces Semblance to drink wine with him and finally to roll the dice. In a short time the old man loses all his possessions. Now, having proved Semblance a hypocrite, Tom unmasks and asks him for his daughter's hand. Nothing more is said of Tom's winnings. In the French piece the old miser, apparently choosing the easiest way out, embraces his future son-in-law and tells him there shall be no more wine, no more gaming, and no more kisses for the servant. To which the young man replies that if one wishes to preach, he should preach by example.

Dunlap is not content with this simple ending. Quite contrary to the custom which he followed in his later adaptations, he outdoes his original in moralizing. He adds a final scene in which Whitely makes a last attempt to persuade Semblance to turn from his evil ways and to give his daughter to Tom. But Semblance, who seems to have accepted the game and the masking as a jest, thanks Tom for the lesson he has taught him and asks him to defer his connection with his family until some further explanations have been made. Semblance does not refuse his daughter to Tom; we are led to believe that eventually he will consent.[7]

The action of both pieces is very slow. The first act of Dunlap's farce is given over entirely to speeches of advice; it is a homily.

---

[7] On this point see Quinn, p. 85 (note).

Both authors introduce a quite superfluous character—Blaise, in the French piece; Whitely, in Dunlap's version. The "comedy" would have gone better without them.[8]

Dunlap's second adaptation from the French was *The School for Soldiers*, a version of *Le Déserteur*[9] by Jean Sébastien Mercier. The play was presented at the Park Theater, New York, July 4, 1799. It was not published and has not survived. The French *drame* was too touching for sensitive souls and required a denouement more satisfying. After discussing the failure of Mercier's *Jenneval* [1781], Gaiffe continues: "L'auteur eut une belle revanche, l'année suivante, avec *Le Déserteur* et *l'Indigent:* la première de ces deux pièces émut si fort les âmes sensibles, qu'il fallut, pour leur complaire, en modifier le dénouement et le faire passer du noir au rose le plus tendre."[10]

The characters of *Le Déserteur* are:

Mme. Luzere, veuve d'un Manufacturier.
Clary, fille de Mme. Luzere.
Durimel, jeune Français, conduisant le commerce dans la maison de Mme. Luzere.
.e Chev. S. Franc, décoré de l'Ordre du Mérite, Major d'un Régiment.
Valcour, jeune Officier.
M. Hoctau, vieux garçon.
Un Domestique.
Des Soldats.
La scène est chez Mme. Luzere.
L'action se passe dans une petite Ville d'Allemagne, frontière de France.

This is a sentimental bourgeois tragedy. Durimel, once a subaltern in the French army, deserted his regiment seven

---

[8] Dunlap states that this piece was "altered to suit the place and people" and "played at Covent Garden, May 18, 1799." *History of the American Theater*, p. 157.

[9] *Le Déserteur*, drame en cinq actes et en prose, par M. Mercier. Nouvelle Édition, Paris, 1787. The play was published in Paris in 1770. It was first played at the Théâtre de Brest, January 23, 1771, and at the Théâtre-Italien, Paris, June 25, 1782. Sedaine's play by the same name was first produced at the Théâtre-Italien, Paris, March 6, 1769.

[10] *Le Drame en France*, p. 216.

years before because of the cruelty of his colonel. As the French and Germans are again at war, this same regiment, by a fateful chance, is billeted in the German village where he has taken refuge. On the morrow Durimel is to espouse Clary, the only child of Mme. Luzere; but M. Hoctau, a disappointed suitor, having learned his secret, betrays him to the colonel. Durimel is arrested and sentenced to be shot as a deserter. A deeper note of tragedy is struck by his discovery of a long-lost father in Major S. Franc, who has lately joined the regiment, and who must give the signal for the execution of his son. Despite the sentence of death, the marriage takes place, all efforts to save the young man having proved futile. At the last moment Valcour, the colonel's son, offers to aid Durimel to escape. But the brave deserter determines to remain because his father's honor is engaged, and he is executed on the morrow.

Dunlap states that his play was "an alteration from *The Deserter* of the French";[11] but he also had John Henry's *School for Soldiers* before him when he made his adaptation. Dr. Coad, who has made a comparison of the respective *dramatis personæ* of these two versions found in Ireland, observes that Dunlap borrowed Henry's revised names, and infers that quite possibly the borrowing did not stop there.[12] To conform to the spirit of the occasion, Dunlap transferred his scene to the American Revolution.

The Robbery, Dunlap's next borrowing from the French, was also unpublished and has not survived. It was an adaptation of a sentimental drama, *Clémentine et Désormes*,[13] produced at Paris twenty years before. Gaiffe calls it, "le plus rapide peut-être et le plus angoissant des drames du XVIII siècle."[14] *The Robbery* was first played at the Park Theater on December 30, 1799, and was unsuccessful.

The characters in *Clémentine et Désormes* are:

---

[11] *History of the American Theater*, p. 272.

[12] *William Dunlap*, p. 196.

[13] *Clémentine et Désormes*, drame en cinq actes et en prose, par [Jacques Marie Boutet de] Monvel; représenté, pour la première fois, aux Français, le 14 décembre, 1780. Paris, 1785.

[14] *Le Drame en France*, p. 102.

M. de Sirvan.
Valville, fils de M. de Sirvan.
M. de Franval, père.
Franval fils.
Désormes, intendant de M. de Sirvan.
Saint-Germain, vieux domestique attaché à Valville.
Charles, Louis } domestiques de M. de Sirvan.
Deux Fermiers.
Clémentine, fille de M. de Sirvan.
Julie, femme d'un certain âge, attachée à Clémentine.
Domestiques de la maison.
La Maréchaussée.
La scène se passe au château de M. de Sirvan, à un quart de lieue d'une petite villa de province.

Désormes, the steward of the estates of M. de Sirvan and lover of Clémentine, resigns his office and resolves to leave; for to-morrow his fortunate rival, Franval, will arrive to espouse his employer's daughter. In his haste to depart, Désormes has forgotten to lock the desk which contains a large sum of bank-notes. Valville, the wild young son of M. de Sirvan, takes the money to pay a debt of honor. A few hours later his father discovers his loss. He orders the arrest of Désormes, who is brought back to the mansion where he meets Franval and discovers in him his father. When young Valville returns to find Désormes under arrest, he quickly confesses his guilt. M. de Sirvan repents his sudden wrath, forgives his son, and joins the hands of Clémentine and Désormes.

On March 8, 1801 Dunlap presented to the audiences at the Park Theater his version of *Abbé de l'Épée*.[15] This sentimental French drama achieved a surprising success. It was almost immediately translated by Kotzebue in Germany and by Holcroft in England.[16] Dunlap, who retained the French title

[15] *Abbé de l'Épée*, drame en cinq actes, par Jean Nicolas Bouilly, représenté pour la première fois sur le Théâtre Français, 14 décembre, 1799. In *Suite du Répertoire du Théâtre Française*. Paris, 1823.

[16] First acted at the Drury Lane Theater, London, February 24, 1801, as *Deaf and Dumb, or the Orphan Protected*. Genest, Vol. 7, p. 501.

for his adaptation, states definitely that he worked from the French model.[17] The characters in the original are:

L'Abbé de l'Épée.
Jules, comte d'Harancour, connu sous le nom de Theodore, sourd et muet.
Darlemont, oncle maternel et tuteur de Jules.
Saint-Alme, fils unique de Darlemont.
Franval, avocat.
Dupré, ancien valet de chambre.
Dubois, valet de chambre de Darlemont.
Dominique, vieux domestique de la famille Franval.
Clemence, sœur de Franval.
Marianne, veuve d'un ancien portier de l'hôtel d'Harancour.
La scène se passe à Toulouse.

The plot of *Abbé de l'Épée*, supposed to be founded on fact —an incident in the life of the French humanitarian, Charles Michel —turns upon the attempt of the Abbé to secure for his ward, a deaf mute, his rightful possessions. Eight years before the play begins, Jules, deaf and dumb, was forsaken in Paris by his Uncle Darlemont. He was found by the kind Abbé and sent to his school for mutes. After long and arduous questioning, the Abbé concludes that Jules has been the victim of a plot to deprive him of his estates. He decides to travel with the boy in an attempt to discover his former home. They finally come to the hôtel d'Harancour, an estate in Toulouse, which Jules recognizes as his birthplace. Here the play begins.

The Abbé enlists the aid of Franval to obtain the lost property. This complicates the situation somewhat, since Clemence, Franval's sister, is in love with Saint-Alme, the son of Darlemont, the usurper. Franval and the Abbé try to persuade Darlemont to cede peacefully his unlawfully acquired possessions. But he refuses to listen to their proposals. Saint-Alme now identifies Jules unmistakably by the scar on his right arm sustained while saving the life of Saint-Alme from a mad dog many

[17] *History of the American Theater*, p. 286.

years before. Still Darlemont refuses to yield. At last his son resorts to heroic measures. Facing his father, Saint-Alme threatens to kill himself unless Darlemont make restitution at once. This brave scene brings about the desired effect. Darlemont returns the estates to Jules. At once the young man signs over one-half his property to Saint-Alme. The Abbé's mission is accomplished.

Dunlap's version was not printed. Dr. Coad has discovered a contemporary reference to it. "A critique in the *New York Evening Post* of December 14 [1801], stated that Dunlap's piece varied considerably from its source, several new scenes being added, and certain episodes merely narrated in the French being actually represented. His alterations were pronounced an interesting, moral, and well-constructed drama."[18]

A version of *Abbé de l'Épée*, printed in America, though not made by an American, does exist. It is entitled *Deaf and Dumb, or The Abbé de l'Épée: an historical drama*, a translation from the French of Bouilly with a preface by Laurent Clerc. Hartford, 1818.

Dunlap's most popular adaptation from the French was *The Voice of Nature*, first performed at the Park Theater, New York, February 4, 1803. This piece is a translation of the very successful *Le Jugement de Salomon* of L. C. Caigniez.[19] Commenting on the French play, Ginisty says: "Mais c'est vers le mélodrame que la mode devait diriger Caigniez et, en 1802, il portait à Corsse—cet acteur comique devenu directeur de l'Ambigu, qui donnait à son public le plaisir de tant pleurer — un *Jugement de Salomon* qui contribua par son succès à la fortune de l'impresario. Corsse, ce qui paraît bien singulier aujourd'hui, gagna trois cent mille francs avec cette pièce: elle ne rapporta que neuf cents francs à son auteur, mais les 'droits' étaient modestes alors. . . .

"Au demeurant, sur l'anecdote classique, Caigniez avait construit une intrigue qui ne manquait pas de quelque ingénio-

---

[18] *William Dunlap*, p. 198.

[19] *Le Jugement de Salomon*, mélodrame en trois actes, par M. Caigniez; Représenté, pour la première fois, sur le Théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique, 18 janvier, 1802. Paris, 1802.

sité. Deux femmes se disputent un enfant. Mais pourquoi? C'est ce qu'il n'avait pas été embarrassé de dire."[20]

The characters in *Le Jugement de Salomon* are:

Salomon, roi d'Israël.
Azélie, princesse d' Égypte, fille du Pharon.
Éliphal, jeune frère de Salomon.
Gareb, ancien officier de David, ministre de Salomon.
Tamira, veuve de Banaïas, devant épouser Éliphal.
Un Enfant, de trois ans, cru fils de Tamira et de Banaïas.
Léila, jeune villageoise des environs d'Hebron, mère de l'enfant.
Débora, vieille nourrice de Léila.
Morad, jardinier de la maison de campagne de Salomon.
Zabel, gouvernante de l'enfant.
Un principal officier de Salomon.
Autres officiers.
Villageois et Villageoises.
Jeunes Filles de Jerusalem.
Égyptiens et Noirs de la suite d'Azélie.
Femmes et Esclaves de Tamira.
Gardes et Peuple.

La scène est à Jerusalem et dans les environs.

A young Israelite, Léila, has been seduced by a fickle prince, who is no other than the brother of Solomon. She learns the rank of the man she has loved after he has left her. Éliphal has left, however, a living souvenir which consoles her for his neglect. But Sobar, the perfidious valet of Tamira, stole the child and substituted a dead babe while Léila was asleep. Tamira's husband had threatened to divorce her unless an heir was born.

Three years later Léila and old Débora, her nurse, have come to Jerusalem to witness the celebration in honor of Princess Azélie of Egypt, who has come to espouse Solomon. Here Léila meets her son and recognizes him by means of certain birth-marks. She appeals to Solomon for justice. It is at this judgment scene that Tamira betrays herself in the well-known

[20] *Le Mélodrame*, pp. 122–23.

manner. Léila recovers her son, and Éliphal makes her his wife.

This melodrama was translated by Boaden and frequently presented in England in 1802. Genest records that it was first acted at the Haymarket Theater, London, on July 31, 1802. He calls it a poor play.[21] Boaden renamed some of the characters and transferred the scene to Sicily. Dunlap adopted Boaden's title, setting, and names, but in other respects his play shows no indebtedness to the English version.

Dunlap's play as first performed in 1803 contained the following cast:

Alphonso, king of Sicily	Mr. Fennel
Rinaldo, his brother	Hodgkinson
Pedro	Hallam, Jun.
Vasquez	Johnson
Child	Miss Hodgkinson
Clarinda	Mrs. Jefferson
Alzaira	Johnson
Benedetta	Hogg
Lilla	Hodgkinson
Isabella	Miss Brett
Laborers, peasants, courtiers, soldiers, etc.	Scene, Sicily.

On the whole, Dunlap has translated his original rather faithfully. As to their dramatic effectiveness, the plays appear pretty evenly balanced. In some scenes Dunlap seems to improve upon his original; in others he fails to take advantage of a dramatic situation. Dunlap's most noteworthy change appears in the last scene. In the French piece Salomon (King Alphonso) orders his executioner to bisect the child on the stage; Dunlap has the child led off for halving. In his *Voice of Nature* Dunlap has not yet overcome his love for moralizing; he invents a few more generous sentiments than he found in the Frenchman.

Both plays are in prose. Dunlap's adaptation contains two or three directions for music; they occur only at the beginning or the end of a scene. There is no evidence that music was

[21] *Some Account of the English Stage*, Vol. 7, p. 561.

used in either play to indicate the key or pitch of emotions.

By his translation and presentation of *Le Jugement de Salomon*, Dunlap became the pioneer in the introduction of the French *mélodrame* on the American stage. On this popular species of dramatic representation—this attempt to join Melpomene to Thalia—Ginisty has written an excellent treatise. He says in part:

> Le mélodrame, cette tragédie populaire qui se hâte vers son but, en cherchant avant tout l'effet, n'est pas né tout d'une pièce. Il est le fils dévoyé du drame sentimental qu'essaya la fin du XVIIIe siècle, non sans résistance; il a mis en œuvre des théories de Diderot, d'une façon que Diderot n'eût pas prévue; il a reçu des leçons de Beaumarchais, du Beaumarchais de la préface d'*Eugénie:* "Il est temps d'intéresser un peuple et de faire couler ses larmes sur un événement tel qu'on le suppose véritable et passé sous ses yeux, entre des citoyens; il ne manquerait jamais de produire de l'émotion. L'éclat du rang n'ajoute rien à la pitié qu'inspirent les malheurs. . . . Le spectacle de la vertu persécutée, mais toujours généreuse, engage l'homme sensible à des retours sur soi-même. . . . La véritable éloquence du drame est celle des situations. . . ."
>
> La formule complete se degagera avec *Cœlina ou l'Enfant du Mystère* (2 septembre 1800) et le mélodrame aura désormais ses lois: quatre personnages essentiels: le troisième rôle, tyran ou traître, souillé de tous les vices, animé de toutes les passions mauvaises—une femme malheureuse ornée de toutes les vertus—un honnête homme protecteur de l'innocence—le comique ou le "niais," selon le terme consacré, qui fera surgir le rire au milieu des pleurs. Le traître persécutera la victime, celle-ci souffrira jusqu'au moment où son infortune étant au comble, l'honnête homme arrivera opportunément pour la délivrer et tirer de son ennemi une vengeance exemplaire, assisté du comique qui se rangera traditionnellement du côté des opprimés. Le style sera imposant par son emphase et par le luxe des maximes morales semées au cours du dialogue, par l'abondance des epithètes. Trois actes, généralement, du moins dans la première période. . . . La structure aura un développement uniforme: le premier acte consacré à l'amour, le second au malheur, le troisième au triomphe de la vertu et au châtiment du crime. Le ballet est ingénieusement amené selon la circonstance, ainsi que le combat, qui est indispensable. La musique qui joue un rôle important (les brochures de Pixerécourt nomment toujours le musicien) souligne les situations dramatiques, accompagne l'entrée et la sortie des personnages, augmente l'effet des émotions produites, "ouvre l'âme et la prépare au genre de sentiments qu'on va développer devant elle."[11]

[11] *Le Mélodrame*, pp. 11–15

These characteristics of the melodrama which Ginisty enumerates have seldom been adhered to in their entirety. The plays of this species do not limit themselves to three acts; some do not contain a *niais* who is to "surgir le rire au milieu des pleurs." Many of them do not employ music to augment the effect and "ouvre l'âme et la prépare au genre de sentiments qu'on va développer devant elle." Few of the published plays of Pixerécourt contain directions for music; we know, however, that he made of the orchestra a powerful ally in their representation. Unquestionably, there was a feeling among dramatists in this period that a new *genre* was being created.

On April 4, 1804, Dunlap produced at the Park Theater another French melodrama of his translation, *The Wife of Two Husbands*. This time he went to the father of French melodrama, Guilbert de Pixerécourt, whose *La Femme à deux maris* appeared in 1802.[23] This piece had had an astonishing success on the continent; it was quickly translated into Russian, Italian, and English. Two versions of it were made in England before 1804—Elizabeth Gunning's close translation, *The Wife With Two Husbands*, which was not acted, and James Cobb's adaptation, *The Wife of Two Husbands*, which began a remarkable run at Drury Lane, November 1, 1803.[24] A feeling of unfair discrimination against her led Miss Gunning to publish her version. In her preface she states that her translation had twice been refused by English stage managers, and that she was almost induced to consign it to oblivion, "had I not heard it was about to be brought forward at Drury Lane Theater; whereupon I determined to present to the public, *The Wife With Two Husbands*, exactly as it has been performed at Paris with unbounded applause." The stage managers, however, exercised good judgment in preferring Cobb's free adaptation to Miss Gunning's translation. Both Cobb and Dunlap have relieved the original of some of its sentimentality and its tedious moralizings.

---

[23] *La Femme à deux maris*, mélodrame en trois actes, par Guilbert-Pixerécourt. Représenté pour la première fois sur le théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique, le 14 septembre, 1802. Paris, 1802

[24] Genest, Vol. 7, p. 600. This chronicler adds: "It is on the whole a moderate play—the serious part of it which is professedly taken from the French, is interesting the—manner of Fritz's death is striking and well contrived—but the characters of Carronade, and Armagh, are mere botches, introduced for the sake of some wretched clap-trap."

The characters of *La Femme à deux maris* are:

Édouard, comte de Fersen, colonel au service de l'empereur
Élisa Werner, sa femme, mariée d'abord à Fritz.
Isidore Fritz, premier mari d'Élisa.
Le Major de Goltz, oncle d'Édouard.
Jules, fils de Fritz et d'Élisa, âgé de quinze ans.
Werner, père d'Élisa, sous le nom de Maurice fermier du château, viellard aveugle.
M. Brown, chapelain du château.
Bataille, caporal invalide, concierge du château.
Gertrude, servante de la ferme.
Walter, compagnon de Fritz.
Domestiques, paysans et paysannes.

The plot and theme are typical of the species—virtue persecuted in the first act and triumphant in the last. Élisa Werner, having learned that her wicked husband, Isidore Fritz, is dead, has married the good Comte de Fersen, who loves and cherishes her and her little son Jules. But the force of the curse which her blind father put upon her for marrying the worthless Fritz is not yet spent. The villainous Isidore Fritz suddenly appears, accuses Élisa of faking the story of his death, and demands the property which her second husband has placed in her name. The countess tries to put off her first husband, but he mocks her prayers. He takes her money and refuses to leave. When the Comte de Fersen discovers the existence of a previous husband, he decides that he and Élisa must separate. He generously offers Fritz a bribe for his promise of non-interference, but Fritz has designs on the whole estate. He and Walter, his wicked accomplice, prepare an ambuscade for the Comte which Bataille, the *niais* of the piece, discovers and frustrates. Fritz is killed by mistake, and the Comte is saved. The blind father, Werner, now learns that his benefactor is his own daughter and graciously decides to lift the fatal curse.

When Dunlap made his adaptation, he must have had the French play and the two British versions before him. His division of the melodrama into five acts, however, is his own

invention. Following Cobb, he renamed several of the French characters and substituted an Irish corporal, Armagh, for Bataille. From Miss Gunning he took a few speeches verbatim; but he refused to accept her close rendering of speeches filled with heavy moralizing. In this matter he showed a decided improvement over his last French adaptation, *The Voice of Nature*. His characterization is better, too, than that in either British version. In his humorous scenes Dunlap follows his own bent and does well.

As *La Femme à deux maris* contained no directions for music, Dunlap was no doubt happily unaware that Pixerécourt made use of this important auxiliary at the Ambigu. The American adaptation contains four or five short songs, but no directions for music to augment the effect of the emotions produced in certain scenes.

Before turning to Dunlap's next borrowing from the French, it might be desirable to consider one peculiar reason for the unprecedented, and far too often unmerited, success of certain French melodramas of this period. With all due consideration for its strong appeal on the sentimental side, *La Femme à deux maris* owed much of its great popularity to the unusual and presumably original plan for assassinating Comte de Fersen. The plan is this: At eight o'clock at night Fritz is to be conducted through the park by the Comte. It has been agreed that Fritz, who is to precede the Comte, is to clap his hands when he reaches the place of ambuscade, and Walter, his accomplice, is to stab the second person who passes the spot. But Bataille, the *niais* of the piece, has overheard the plot and frustrates it. He passes the fatal spot a moment ahead of Fritz and gives the signal. Thus Fritz is the second to pass and suffers the fate prepared for another. With a child-like disregard for all *vraisemblance*, the writers of melodrama feverishly seized upon any novel situation or ingenious scene for audiences calmly uncritical. Such unusual scenes will be found in other plays considered in this study.[25]

---

[25] Particularly in Noah's *Wandering Boys*, R P. Smith's *Eighth of January*, and Payne's *Peter Smink*.

That American playwrights appropriated any foreign plays most readily accessible and exercised little care and judgment in their selection, is evident from the nature of the pieces which they adapted. So long as a play had a foreign source it had some chance of success on the American stage. Comedy, tragedy, tragi-comedy, melodrama, farce—all alike were grist for the American hopper.

It is possible, however, that American dramatic writers were limited in their choice. This would seem to be the case in Dunlap's next adaptation, *Nina*,[26] a most tearful affair, brought out unsuccessfully at the Park Theater, December 28, 1804. *Nina* belonged to that strange species developed by Nivelle de la Chaussée in his *le Préjugé à la mode* (1735), and aptly styled by Lanson "La Comédie larmoyante."[27]

Dunlap's adaptation was never published. The characters of the French piece are:

> Nina, Fille du Comte et ayant perdu la raison depuis quelques mois.
> Le Comte, son Père.
> Georges, Nourricier du Comte.
> Elise, Femme de confiance et Gouvernante de Nina.
> Germeuil, Amant de Nina, cru mort.
> Mathurine, Paysanne.
> Paysans, Viellards, Enfans, Jeunes Paysannes.

Nina was in love with Germeuil, a worthy young man. The count, however, compelled her to accept the addresses of a wealthy suitor. Germeuil fought a duel with his rival and is believed killed. When Nina was asked to marry the slayer of her lover, she became insane. Finally, Germeuil appears, and after many sentimental phrases have been exchanged, Nina recovers. This sickly piece is given over to the maunderings of the unhappy Nina. In the original the many lines to be sung

---

[26] *Nina, ou la Folle par Amour*, comédie en un acte, en prose, melée d'ariettes; par M. Marsollier. Musique de M. Dalayrac. Représentée, pour la première fois, par les Comédiens Italiens ordinaires du Roi, le 15 Mai, 1786. Paris, 1786.

[27] *Nivelle de la Chaussée et la Comédie larmoyante*, p. 274.

must have been its only *raison d'être*, which rapidly disappeared in translation.

Nina was the last translation from the French which Dunlap made as manager of the Park Theater. The period between *Nina* and John Howard Payne's first borrowing from the French, *The Maid and the Magpie*, 1816, is marked by the appearance of two plays by American authors working from French originals.

The first of these was John D. Turnbull's *Rudolph; or, The Robbers of Calabria: a Melo Drame, in three acts, with marches, combats and choruses*, first performed at the Boston Theater, May 13, 1807. This wild and spectacular melodrama is a translation of *La Forêt périlleuse ou les Brigands de la Calabre* by Loaisel-Tréogate.[28]

The characters in the French melodrama are:

Colisan, jeune officier au service du Roi de Naples.
Camille, amante de Colisan.
Fresco, valet de Colisan.
Le Capitaine des voleurs.
Morgan, Brisemont, L'Ardent } voleurs.
Bande de voleurs.
La scène est dans une forêt de la Calabre.

A note at the bottom of the page suggests that "Ces voleurs doivent être bien costumés, parce qu'ils sont riches, et cependant avoir l'air épouvantable; moustaches, barbes épaisses, rousses et noires, etc."

This disordered melodrama betrays the influence of the Gothic romance of the period. Colisan has lost his beloved Camille in the forest of Calabria. In their search for her, he and his servant Fresco, who is to furnish the needed comic relief, come upon the robber's den, which is "artfully concealed by a piece of rock that turns on a pivot." It is only by chance that

[28] *La Forêt périlleuse ou les Brigands de la Calabre:* Drame en trois actes, en prose, par J. M. Loaisel-Tréogate. Représentée pour la première fois, sur le Théâtre de la Cité, le 18 Floréal de l'an V (17 Mai, 1797). Paris, 1798.

they discover the rendezvous of the brigands, who have forgotten to lock the door. Colisan and Fresco enter the cave.

Within the den "in a back scene" is "a dungeon in the rock, with a grate concealed by a black curtain," and "near it hangs a key." Hearing a groan, Colisan investigates and finds his beautiful Camille locked in the dungeon behind the black curtain. The key most obligingly hangs on the wall, and Camille is freed without delay. Now to flee this wicked place! Alas, the door to the cave is locked. The lieutenant of the banditti, remembering his indiscretion, has returned to turn the key. Colisan must now devise some scheme of escape. Camille is to be made the bride of the robber chief this very night; therefore Colisan persuades her to accept his attentions and to poison him at supper. The robbers return and Fresco and Col san conceal themselves.

Camille and the captain sup alone. He discovers her putting poison in his cup. Dissembling his feelings, he asks that the cups be exchanged. She falters. Thereupon the captain attacks Camille, and Colisan enters to defend her. The brigands appear and overpower Colisan, who is led away to be shot at once. A few moments later the corpse is brought in on a bier. As Camille is shedding bitter tears over his body, Colisan rises from the bier to bid his beloved take heart, for the bandits selected to shoot him are spies and his friends. Just then the bandit chief appears and attempts to drag Camille off the stage. Colisan seizes a pistol, carelessly laid upon the table, and kills the wicked captain. With many thanks to divine Providence, the play is brought to an end.

Turnbull retains all the characters of the French piece, but he renames three arbitrarily. *Rudolph* is a translation which contains the same situations as its original with only the slightest variations. In plot, setting, and stage business Turnbull closely follows his model, but he renders the dialogue in good idiom. *Rudolph* calls for many stage effects—thunder, lightning, rain. It also contains remarkable directions for music, the first of their kind to be found in any pr nted American play. To heighten the emotional effect are directions for "music expressive of distrust," of "suspicion," of "agitation," and of "exultation."

The original play contains no such directions, though all these effects may have been used on the French stage.

Rudolph; or, The Robbers of Calabria was performed in 1807 with the following cast:

Count Albert, a Sicilian nobleman.....Mr. Caulfield
Paulo, his confidential servant.....Mr. Bernard
Morgano, a Sicilian officer.....Mr. Usher
Alfiro, lieutenant of Banditti.....Mr. Fox
Barnardo, officer of Banditti.....Mr. Downie
Rudolph, captain of Banditti.....Mr. Fennell
Sicilian soldiers disguised as robbers, Banditti
Rosolia di Borgia, a Sicilian lady betrothed to Albert,
Mrs. Powell

Rudolph appeared on the Boston Theater in the very heyday of melodrama. Kotzebue in Germany, Pixerécourt in France, and Holcroft and Dibdin in England were the leading exponents of this new species. Popularizing romantic ideas, avowing democratic and humanitarian sentiments, and introducing scenes of terror and thrilling escapes, this new form of drama for the first quarter of the nineteenth century thrust aside all other forms of dramatic entertainment. In *Rudolph* we meet melodrama that has borrowed the paraphernalia of mediaevalism and the terrific school, with a maximum of action, music, and machinery, and a minimum of plot and characterization.

The second adaptation of Pixerécourt on the American stage appeared as *Paul and Alexis, or the Orphans of the Rhine*[29] at the Charleston Theater in 1812. This was the work of Mordecai M. Noah, a Philadelphian, who tells us that his play was sent to London, where, with slight alterations probably made by John Kerr, it was presented at Covent Garden on February 24, 1814, as *The Wandering Boys, or the Castle of Olival.* When it again

[29] From *Le Pélerin Blanc*, drame en trois actes, en prose, et a [sic] grand spectacle; par R. C. Guilbert-Pixerécourt. Représenté, pour la première fois, sur le théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique, le 16 germinal an 9 [April 6, 1801]. Paris, 1802.

returned to America in 1820 it retained this new title and enjoyed a long life.[30]

As in the case of his *Cœlina* and *La Femme à deux maris*, Pixerécourt took his idea for *Le Pélerin Blanc* from a romance of Ducray-Duminil entitled *Les Petits Orphelins du Hameau*. The source of this tale, however, goes back to Marsollier, who in 1789 composed with his collaborator, Dalayrac, an opera called *Les Petits Savoyards*, which all France applauded for forty years. The brilliant success which the rôles of the two Savoyards obtained evidently determined Pixerécourt to retell their story in his melodrama.[31]

The characters in *Le Pélerin Blanc* are:

Le comte de Castelli.
La baronne de Castelli, nièce du comte, et châtelaine d'Olival.
Paul, Justin } enfans abandonnés.
Roland, intendant de la châtelaine.
Gervais, notable du hameau d'Olival.
Marceline, fermière d'Olival.
Jacquinet, neveu de Gervais.
Louise, fille de Marceline, promise à Jacquinet.
Un Garde.
Gardes de la Châtelaine.
Paysans et Paysannes.

The scene is the hamlet of Olival in Provençe in 1645. The play begins with the preparations for a fête—a very common element in the melodrama, totally unnecessary to the plot, but introduced perhaps to heighten the effect of the unhappy scenes to follow. The villagers are in the midst of their wedding celebration when Paul and Justin appear. The wandering boys confide in Gervais, the leading man of the village. They show him a small casket, which was given to them by their dying mother with the injunction that it was not to be opened until they had reached the age of eighteen. This casket contains the

[30] See Quinn, pp. 193–94.
[31] Hartog, p. 95.

proofs of their rights to the estates which the present châtelaine, their cousin, has usurped.

Roland conducts the boys to the castle. When the baroness discovers the identity of the unfortunate children (for, of course, they must drop the casket in her presence), she consents to the murderous scheme of her wicked steward. The boys must be poisoned. But there is a guardian angel who has heard all, and who will watch every gesture of the black-hearted Roland. This is the deaf porter, who is no other than the Comte de Castelli in disguise and the father of the wandering boys. He determines to foil the dastardly plot.

Now occurs the big scene of the play. Paul and Justin are seated in the arbor, enjoying a much-needed repast. Roland enters bringing a panier with two bottles of wine. The bottle to the left and nearest the boys contains the deadly draught. While Roland turns his back for a moment, the Comte, who has been loitering on the scene, gently turns the panier around. The villainous steward now suggests a toast to the health of the baroness and pours out the wine. Roland drinks the poisoned fluid.

After other thrilling experiences at the castle, the boys escape and take refuge in the cottage of Gervais; but the base steward, in whose vile body poison works but slowly, follows and accuses them of theft. As Roland is about to lead the children back to the castle, he is stopped by a pilgrim dressed in white. Then, throwing off his disguise, this pilgrim discloses the Comte de Castelli to the startled villagers. He immediately orders the arrest of Roland, who plays the unrepentant villain to the bitter end. The baroness retires to a convent, and the count and his two children once more come into their own.

Noah's play is an adaptation, not a translation. If it shows any improvement on its model, it is in the fact that less stress is laid upon the fête and a little more upon the main plot. Noah makes of this three-act melodrama a two-act piece, the second act having three scenes. He invents one scene and one character, which are, however, quite unnecessary. His rustic characters are well drawn. Their dialogue is simple and native, and

their homely similes are good. Like *La Femme à deux maris* discussed above, this play also contains a scene, presumably original, to which at least a part of its remarkable success was due. The poisoning scene in which the tables are turned upon the vile steward must have afforded breathless moments to thousands of spectators.

III

Plays Produced from 1816 to 1828

John Howard Payne began his career as an adaptor of French dramatic pieces by choosing a melodrama, "le chef-d'œuvre du genre immortalisé par la musique de Rossini."[1] This was *Pie Voleuse ou la Servante de Palaiseau*, the first effort of Baudouin D'Aubigny, who received his inspiration from a French *cause célèbre*. The play was a grand success in France. Ginisty observes: "La *Pie Voleuse*, représentée pendant les Cent Jours, ne souffrit pas des événements politiques. Le théâtre n'a-t-il pas presque toujours bravé les circonstances qui sembleraient devoir lui nuire le plus? Commencée sous le retour de l'Empereur, la pièce acheva sa carriere sous les Bourbons."[2]

Pie Voleuse is the dramatization of a famous tale. The poor servant, Annette, is truly the victim of the most incredible mischances. One day while she is arranging the silverware of her mistress, Madame Gervais, her father appears before her in a disguise. He is an old soldier who has deserted his regiment and is fleeing from the results of an act of insubordination. At the end of his resources, he still possesses one small piece of silverware. As he is unable to sell it himself, he persuades his daughter to do so and to put the money in the hollow trunk of an old tree. Madame Gervais discovers the loss of a piece of silver and notifies the bailiff. He learns that Annette has sold a piece of silver to the Jew Isaac, and three small coins are found in her kerchief, for she has not had time to hide them as directed. All the evidence is against her; if she tells the truth, her father must perish. She is condemned to die for the theft. As she approaches the scaffold, a young peasant arrives to prove her innocence. While he had been counting the three coins which Annette had given him to place in the hollow tree, a thievish

---

[1] Royer, Vol. 5, p. 374.
[2] *Le Mélodrame*, p. 137.

magpie brazenly stole one out of his hand. He pursued it to its nest and there discovered the lost piece of silver. Annette is innocent, and to make the denouement entirely satisfactory, her father is pardoned.

The possibilities of this melodrama were quickly realized by British adaptors; at least three versions appeared before the end of the year. Unfortunately, Payne's adaptation was not printed and has not survived. His piece was refused by the manager of Drury Lane only because another version had already been accepted;[3] but the *Maid and the Magpie* performed at Covent Garden on September 15, three days after the piece recorded by Genest was produced at Drury Lane, was probably Payne's.[4] It was his version which was produced at the Park Theater, New York, April 1, 1816.

On May 10, 1816 was presented at the Park Theater, New York, Payne's version of *La Famille d'Anglade*,[5] his first adaptation from the French to be printed. It was played at Drury Lane, London, February 1, 1816. Genest records another version, in two acts, *Portfolio, or, The Family of Anglade*, made by Kenney and played on the same night at Covent Garden. He adds that Payne's piece was better than Kenney's.[6] Since this play was presented on the British stage just three weeks after its first appearance in Paris, it must have been due to the rivalry of managers rather than to the assured popularity of the adaptation that it was produced simultaneously in the two great patent theaters of England.

The astonishing success of *La Pie Voleuse*, the idea of which was taken from a judicial error found in *Causes Célèbres*, apparently induced the authors of *La Famille d'Anglade* to seek inspiration from the same source. In volume one, part two, of *Causes Célèbres* is found the record of a famous trial entitled

---

[3] This was *Magpie; or, The Maid of Palaiseau*, acted at Drury Lane, September 12, 1815, according to Genest, who adds that it was attributed to Dibdin. He continues: "The first version of this piece was made by Arnold, and brought out at the Lyceum on 21st of Aug., in two acts; it was called 'Maid and the Magpie, or Which is the Thief.'" Vol. 8, p. 515.

[4] On this point see Quinn, p. 169 (note).

[5] From *La Famille d'Anglade, ou le Vol*, mélodrame en trois actes, a [sic] grand spectacle, tiré des *Causes Célèbres*, par Mm. Fournier et Frédéric [du Petit-Méré]; représenté, pour la première fois, sur le théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, le 11 janvier, 1816. Paris, 1816.

[6] *Some Account of the English Stage*, Vol. 8, p. 549.

"D'Anglade"; but the authors of the melodrama took little more than the name and the idea of a false arrest from this tragic tale of justice miscarried.

The characters of *La Famille d'Anglade* are:

Adolphe d'Anglade.
Lina de Senesse, son épouse.
Alphonse, leur fils, âgé de cinq ans.
Madame de Cerval, veuve d'un riche armateur.
D'Olsan, neveu de Madame de Cerval.
Léon d'Assaudray, cousin-germain de d'Anglade.
Bertaud, vieux domestique de confiance du même.
René, valet de chambre de d'Olsan.
Fourbin, intrigant, ami de René.
Marcel, jardinier de Madame de Cerval.
Un officier supérieur de la justice.
Dumont, bijoutier.
Le Greffier.
Cinq agens de police.
Un Brigadier de Maréchaussée.
Musiciens italiens.
Garçons jardiniers.
Paysans, paysannes, danseurs, danseuses.
Huit cavaliers de maréchaussée.

The scene is Marseilles in 1687. The profligate d'Olsan is enamored of Madame d'Anglade, who rejects his suit. His aunt, Madame de Cerval, promises to give him 20,000 louis, which she has locked in her desk, if he will give up his guilty passion and marry another at once. But the dissolute young man prefers the wicked counsels of his valet René, who plots the ruin of d'Anglade. A happy chance now occurs to further their base design. In the midst of the inevitable fête appears Léon d'Assaudray, who was supposed lost in a shipwreck fifteen years before. He makes peremptory demand for his property which his cousin d'Anglade has inherited. The latter willingly consents to make restitution in full, but in so doing beggars himself.

At the request of his wife, d'Anglade prepares to sell her jewels. Overhearing this plan, René determines to steal the 20,000 louis on the night before d'Anglade disposes of the jewels. The next morning Fourbin, his associate, personates the jeweller and buys the stones from d'Anglade. The transfer having taken place, d'Anglade unconsciously becomes the possessor of 15,000 stolen louis. The jewels and the pocketbook of Madame de Cerval containing the remainder of the stolen notes, except 500 louis, are insidiously placed beneath a sofa pillow in the study.

The police search the house and make the arranged discovery. Despite the protests of Madame de Cerval and Léon d'Assaudray, d'Anglade is committed to prison. The law must be obeyed. At length, however, through the villainy of the confederates, who are eager each to cheat the other of the 500 louis, notes to that amount are found upon René. Suspicion likewise attaches to Fourbin, his accomplice. He is apprehended and recognized as the pretended jeweller. While in separate custody, these wretches are lured into mutual recrimination, and the whole secret is disclosed. D'Olsan to avoid an ignomini us death becomes a suicide. The wronged husband is restored to his family.

In the preface to his play Payne tells us that the French melodrama suggested the idea and furnished the leading incidents for *Accusation*. He states further that "Great changes have been made in the sentiments and dialogue." This statement, however, is not supported by the evidence. As a matter of fact, the sentiments are just the same.[7] Although many speeches are cut down, and in a few scenes omitted altogether, the rendering of ideas is close at every point. The translation is free and idiomatic. Payne follows closely the directions for stage business in his original and renames a few characters the better to suit an English audience.

---

[7] Payne rendered closely the sententious phrases of his model. In Act 1, Scene 5, of the French piece the following lines occur:

René: Quoi! ce serait par jalousie! . . . Tant mieux, Monsieur! un mari qui devient jaloux a bientôt sujet de l'être.

In Payne's play, Hubert (René renamed) says:

Jealousy? . . . So much the better, Sir, so much the better. A husband who suspects his wife without cause, is apt to be the cause of what he suspects.

In this same preface to *Accusation* Payne records his feelings with regard to the greater difficulties under which the British playwright labored as compared with the French. He says in part:

> The persons who frequent the Theaters of Paris in which melo-drames are acted, seldom scrutinize the literary or moral merits of the productions which they applaud. Audiences are classed in different Theaters in Paris, as they are in different parts of the same Theater in London. Instead of a vast building in which the lovers of Shakespeare and sense, every quality of auditor has there a distinct Theater appropriate to its quality of taste. Should the national Theater in the Rue de Richelieu dare to represent a melo-drame, even the powers of Talma could not protect it from public indignation. But as the taste on this side of the channel is too modern for the polish of the loftier French Drama, and too polished to admit any thing from their minor Theaters (the only sources in Paris whence Covent Garden and Drury Lane borrow),—without great and studied alteration,—the adaptor of a French production becomes liable to all the labour of an original writer without entitling himself to equal fame. To this labour the adaptor of the present play has been condemned.

Payne's version was sent from Paris before the original appeared on the French boards. Perhaps because of his intimacy with the great Talma and other French people of the stage, Payne was allowed the use of the manuscript before the melodrama was presented at Paris; or, what seems less likely, the play may have been published before it was acted.

Payne's next adaptation led him into the field of romantic tragedy. *Brutus*, first presented at Drury Lane, December 3, 1818, and introduced to American audiences at the Park Theater, March 15, 1819, is Payne's finest tragedy. Better than any other of his plays, *Brutus* illustrates his remarkable skill as an adaptor.[8] In his preface Payne tells us that there were seven plays upon the subject of Brutus and that he has not hesitated to adopt the conceptions and language of his predecessors. One of these predecessors was Voltaire, a French edition of whose *Brutus* appeared first in 1731. William Duncombe in 1732 undertook

---

[8] For an excellent analysis of the sources of this play, see Quinn, pp. 170–74.

a revision of this play for the English stage. In 1734 his version was brought out at Drury Lane; it was printed in 1735 and reprinted in 1747.

Duncombe's alterations were in full accord with the custom of the English. Blank verse replaced Alexandrines; lengthy recitals were shortened or broken into dialogue. Duncombe's changes affected the characters and the action of the whole, but it was in the rôle of Brutus that he made his most significant contribution. The thin reserved action of his original to an English audience would seem to lack humanity. Romantic freedom was made to take the place of classic repression; emotion was given a tongue. Thus the frigidity of the major characters was warmed by the addition of passages of grief and pity, and the action was enlivened by the direct presentation of violent deeds that were narrated in the original.[9]

But *Brutus* is not essentially a French adaptation. Payne had Duncombe's version and Voltaire's play before him when he made his adaptation; however, as Professor Quinn has shown, the verbal similarities between Duncombe's translation of Voltaire's play and Payne's *Brutus* amount to only thirty-seven lines. Payne owed most to Cumberland and Downman.

But melodrama was proving too popular on all the boards to be longer neglected. Though Payne's position in January, 1821 offered him little choice in adapting (he was lodged in a debtor's prison for debts incurred in his attempt at the management of the Sadler's Wells Theater), by a stroke of good fortune he received, on January 16, an anonymous parcel containing two very popular French melodramas—*Calas* and *Thérèse*. He at once set to work adapting the latter, and on February 2, 1821, *Therese, the Orphan of Geneva* was presented at Drury Lane.[10] A short time later, on April 30, the piece made its first appearance in America at the Anthony Street Theater, New York. Believing that the French author himself sent his plays to him, Payne wrote in his journal: "I am indebted to M. Victor for the compliment which he paid me in so mysterious

[9] H. L. Bruce, *Voltaire on the English Stage*, Chap. 2.

[10] Genest mentions another version, *Henriette, or the Farm of Senange*, brought out at Covent Garden, February 23, 1821, acted four times, and not printed. Vol. 9, p. 106.

a manner. I beg to return my thanks for it, and at the same time ask his indulgence towards some alterations in the construction of the drama, especially so in the third act."[11] It is pleasing to note that in less than a month the profits of *Thérèse* delivered Payne from the debtor's prison and enabled him to return to Paris in the interests of the Drury Lane Theater.

In his discussion of the French piece Ginisty writes: "Un autre succès de larmes, ce fut *Thérèse ou l'Orpheline de Genève*, où la forte imagination de Ducange, que rien n'arrêtait, avait trouvé des effets saisissants pour l'époque. Thérèse est le type même de la victime de mélodrame."[12] This melodrama enjoyed, with *Calas*, a popular success which Pixerécourt himself might have envied.

Thérèse[13] contains the following characters:

Mme. de Sénange, dame du château de ce nom (veuve).
Charles de Sénange, fils de Mme. de Sénange.
Thérèse, sous le nom d'Henriette (orpheline).
Égerthon, ministre protestant.
Valther, Génevois.
Picard, ancien intendant.
Mathurin, fermier.
Brigite, femme de Mathurin, fermière.
Nanette, servante de Brigite.
Domestiques.

This is a melodrama with all the conventional thrills. Thérèse, under the name of Henriette, has been adopted by Madame de Sénange. This homeless orphan is about to become the bride of Charles, the son of her kind patroness. At this point the infamous Valther appears. He has cheated Thérèse out of her inheritance and holds the key to the mystery of her birth. If she refuses to marry him, he will expose her before Madame de

---

[11] Harrison, p. 99.

[12] *Le Mélodrame*, p. 150.

[13] *Thérèse, ou l'Orpheline de Genève*, mélodrame en trois actes, par M. Victor [Ducange]; représenté, pour la première fois, sur le théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique, 23 novembre, 1820. In *Chefs-d'Œuvre du Répertoire des Mélodrames*. Paris, 1825.

Sénange and deliver her to the law, for Thérèse has been unjustly found guilty of forging a will and escaped punishment only by the connivance of this villain. Overwhelmed with despair, Thérèse decides to leave the home of her benefactress on the advice of pastor Égerthon. But at the last moment she weakens and would have married Charles, if Valther had not arrived on the scene to denounce her. Now she is driven from the château.

To escape a coming storm Thérèse takes refuge at the farm of Mathurin, tenant of Madame de Sénange. By a remarkable coincidence Charles and his mother are caught in the same storm and take shelter at the same farm. Valther, who has been relentlessly pursuing his victim, determines now to put her out of the way. In the height of the storm he enters the chamber of Madame de Sénange and murders her, thinking all the while that he has stabbed Thérèse. A moment later a bolt of lightning strikes the pavilion in which the murdered woman was sleeping and sets it on fire. Thérèse hastens to save her late benefactress and is seen returning with a bloody knife in her hand. All the evidence is against the poor girl.

Happily the venerable pastor Égerthon believes her innocent and prepares to defend her. He suspects the cruel Valther, whom some peasants have just caught prowling around the farm. Égerthon, resolving upon a plan to trap the villain into a confession of his guilt, secures the consent of the magistrate of the canton to conduct the investigation.

Now we approach the big scene of the play. Égerthon accuses Valther of the murder of Thérèse. Valther, certain that it was Thérèse whom he has slain, makes a poor defense. Égerthon notes his trepidation and employs a bold scheme. He challenges Valther to prove his innocence by daring him to walk into the next room, to place his hand upon the bleeding corpse, and to swear that he is not the murderer. As Valther, greatly troubled, prepares to accept the challenge, the door opens and Thérèse slowly advances pointing an accusing finger at him. The miserable wretch is undone. Thinking this to be the ghost of his victim, he confesses all. At her feet he throws the papers that prove her innocence and establish her birthright. Thérèse

sinks into the arms of her lover. This scene would assure the success of any melodrama of the period.

In *Therese* Payne shows his growing skill as an adaptor of melodramas. In dramatic effectiveness he frequently betters his original. Many scenes in the original are unnecessarily long. These scenes Payne cuts down; he omits entirely others which do not enhance the action of the piece. He follows his model faithfully in stage business and in the more important scenes, but his rendering is always free. The speeches of rustics he domesticates in excellent fashion.

Payne renames some of the French characters. Valther becomes Carwin, a synonym for wickedness to all who had read *Wieland*, the famous novel of Brockden Brown. Madame de Sénange becomes the Countess de Morville, and her son the Count de Morville. Pastor Égerthon is renamed Fontaine.

As Payne himself has said, his greatest alterations were made in the third act. In this act Payne has a charge of murder brought against Thérèse in her presence on the stage; in the French piece no definite charge of murder is made. In Payne's final scene in which Thérèse confronts the frightened wretch, she holds the murderer's knife in her hand; the French play omits the knife.

Neither play contains directions for music to heighten the effects. Much is made of the mother's oath in both plays: "May the tomb yawn and swallow me before I consent to this detested union." This is to be regarded as dramatic foreshadowing. Both plays call for thunder and lightning and the destruction of the pavilion by a thunderbolt. This is splendid melodramatic machinery. The murder scene and the confession scene were quite enough to make the play.

Upon his return to Paris in 1821, Payne went to the fountainhead of French melodrama when he made his version of Pixerécourt's *Valentine ou la Séduction*[14] for his British employers. *Adeline, the Victim of Seduction*, one of the least fortunate of his adaptations, was first presented at Drury Lane, February 9,

---

[14] *Valentine, ou la Séduction*, mélodrame en trois actes, par M. Guilbert-Pixerécourt; représenté, pour la première fois, sur le théâtre de la Gaîté, 13 décembre, 1821. Paris, 1822.

1822, and at the Park Theatre, New York, May 1, 1822. This was Payne's first and only experience with the work of Pixerécourt.

Valentine, which appears to be entirely the invention of the French playwright, has the following characters:

Le Comte de Noralberg, ministre et favori du Prince.
Édouard, son fils, sous le nom d'Adrien.
La Comtesse Honora, sa bru.
Le Baron Ernest, chambellan du Prince, et ami d'Édouard.
Albert, vieil invalide, aveugle.
Valentine, sa fille.
Mme. Germain, femme de confiance du Baron.
Léonard, jardinier.
Guillaume, valet de chambre d'Édouard.
Un Domestique.
Seigneurs et Dames.
Plusieurs Domestiques.

The scene is laid in Germany. Valentine, the daughter of Albert, a blind invalid soldier, is the victim of a mock marriage to Édouard, who has assumed the name of Adrien. For two years Édouard, who is already married, has posed as a poor artist in his attempt to seduce the virtuous girl. Finally, as a last resource the mock ceremony is performed through the pernicious counsels of Baron Ernest, the villain of the piece. The day after the nuptials the poor girl discovers the horror of her position. Here the action commences.

Valentine opens the play with the startling lines: "Oh Ciel! je ne suis point mariée!" She is a captive in the country house of Baron Ernest, whence Édouard had brought her after the sham ceremony. With the help of Léonard, the gardener, she escapes to her father's cottage. Honora, the legitimate spouse of Édouard, when informed of her husband's base conduct, expresses the tenderest interest and offers to help the unfortunate girl. When the blind father meets his daughter's seducer he makes a pathetic attempt to engage him in a duel. But Valentine can no longer survive her dishonor. Being assured that her

father will have an asylum for his last days, she throws herself into the stream which flows through the gardens of the palace of the Comte de Noralberg, the father of the man she loved. This catastrophe takes place during a fête, which is assuredly introduced to heighten the tragic effect. Édouard remains a prey to grief and remorse, and the sad scene closes with the blind father crying, "Ma fille est morte! Grand Dieu! Otez-moi la vie que je ne puis supporter sans elle!"

Valentine is the only one of Pixerécourt's fifty-two melodramas which violates his own rule for a successful ending. The heroine remains unfortunate to the last. In his study of this piece, Hartog says, "Elle sort du genre ordinaire du mélodrame. Cette pièce, d'une conception très hardie et de l'effet le plus vigoureux, est plutôt une tragédie bourgeoise qu'un mélodrame."[15] Though the ending is unhappy, the spirit and machinery of the piece are those of melodrama. The situations are forced, and the dialogue is turgid to the last degree. The virtuous characters are continually moralizing, and their speeches overflow with generous sentiments. The inevitable fête is present to enforce the contrast between the happy and the unfortunate. Genest doubtless voiced the general disapproval of the ending. "Nearly the whole of it is interesting, but the catastrophe is horrid and disgusting—Adeline's rash and foolish attempt at suicide takes off vastly from the pity which her sufferings had previously excited—she had been disobedient to her father, and shamefully deceived by Wilhelm, but it is only by her own act, that she becomes guilty of any serious crime."[16]

Payne changes the name of every character in the French piece and omits that of Madame Germain. Both plays are full of sentimentality, the original being the greatest offender. In the scene between the outraged invalid father and his daughter's seducer, Pixerécourt achieves the better effect. In the final scene, too, Payne is found wanting. He has his heroine fished from the river to speak two lines before expiring; the Frenchman exhibits her corpse on a boat. There is, in fact, little to

---

[15] *Guilbert de Pixerécourt*, p. 164.

[16] *Some Account of the English Stage*, Vol. 9, p. 146.

choose between the original and the adaptation. No amount of revision could have made of *Valentine* an acceptable play.

Perhaps to seek relief from his last sombre tale, Payne now essayed the adaptation of a comedy. He turned to Eugène Scribe and adapted his pleasant little comedy, *Michel et Christine*.[17] Payne's version, which he named *Love in Humble Life*, was first presented at Drury Lane, February 14, 1822. It made its first appearance in America at the Franklin Theater, New York, July 25, 1837.

Michel et Christine, highly praised by Lenient,[18] is a one-act comedy with four characters:

Stanislas, soldat.
Christine, jeune aubergiste.
M chel, son cousin.
Guillaume, garçon d'auberge.

The scene is somewhere in Poland. Stanislas, a Polish soldier on the march, finds his friend Christine the mistress of a tavern which she has bought with the money he has sent her. He proposes marriage, but she tells him that she loves Michel, a cowardly creature. However, to show her gratitude to the brave soldier, Christine promises to wed no one without his permission. When Michel arrives, she learns that he intends to go into the great world and make a name for himself before he marries; thereupon Christine enlists the aid of Stanislas to represent himself as her husband. When Michel realizes what a treasure he has lost he laments his unkind fate. Now assured that these two young people are hopelessly in love, Stanislas gives his consent to their union and marches away to join his company.

Payne makes a clever adaptation of this sentimental comedy. He renames the male characters; Stanislas becomes Ronslaus,

---

[17] *Michel et Christine*, comédie-vaudeville en un acte, représentée pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le théâtre du Gymnase dramatique, le 3 décembre, 1821, en société avec M. Dupin. In *Œuvres Choisies de E. Scribe*. Paris, 1845.

[18] "Cependant, quelques-unes de ces petites pièces, telles que *Michel et Christine*. . . . n'en resteront pas moins ses véritables chefs-d'œuvre, les bijoux de son répertoire." Vol. 1, p. 314.

and Michel Carlitz. To heighten the comic effect, Ronslaus is made a more formidable fellow than the French Stanislas. Payne translates epithets well. In the original, when Christine asks the soldier whether he loves her, he replies, "Morbleu! plus que jamais." Payne makes him reply, "By the great cannons! I love you better than fighting." The French piece contains about thirty-five lines to be sung. These are not appropriate, for they violate the tone of the comedy. Payne either omits them or translates them to be spoken. The adaptor develops humorous effects not found in his model, and sometimes by a slight departure from the text he contrives to give more animation to the scene. But, on the whole, Payne follows Scribe fairly closely and renders his comedy in good English idiom.

Genest records an interesting exception which was made to this play: "It was objected to this piece, that Christine ought to have married Ronslaus rather than Carlitz, he being the more worthy of her—Payne replies that if women will be anomalous in their affections, dramatists must paint them as they find them."[19]

Another comic piece followed. *Peter Smink; or, The Armistice* was presented at the Surrey Theater, a minor London playhouse, on July 8, 1822; it was played at the Park Theater, New York, for the first time on October 14, 1826. The central idea —the incident of the armistice—for this one-act comedy Payne took from *Le Maréchal de Luxembourg* (1812) by Frédéric and Boirie, whose play furnished Richard Penn Smith with the plot for *The Eighth of January*. A discussion of this French melodrama will be found in connection with Smith's adaptation.

The characters in Peter Smink are:

Chevalier Bayard.
Hantz, a miller.
Peter Smink.
Eugene.
Commandant.

[19] *Some Account of the English Stage*, Vol. 9, p. 148.

Peasant.
Ninette.
Soldiers.

The scene is a mill in a small village on the frontiers of France. The Commandant of the German forces is seeking Chevalier Bayard to request an armistice for six hours. The Chevalier arrives at the mill disguised as a miller, and old Hantz takes him for Peter Smink, whom he had expected. When the true Peter Smink arrives, Hantz mistakes him for the Chevalier, whose disguise has become generally known. The Commandant returns and throws the armistice on a table, disappointed in his failure to find Bayard. He assumes that Peter Smink is the disguised Chevalier and orders his arrest. Just then Bayard hurries to the table and signs the armistice. Now the Commandant must allow him a safe-conduct through the German lines.

By this time Payne's relations with the managers of Drury Lane were not of a kind to strengthen his allegiance to that theatre. The vacillating policy and frequent delays of Elliston began to prove irksome. Consequently, when Charles Kemble assumed the management of Covent Garden, Payne was not slow to accept his offer to act as theatrical scout for the rival house. Indeed, his first adaptation to be produced by Kemble shows great haste in composition, and Payne must have taken this piece less seriously than any other of his adaptations. It is a melodrama the most bizarre that had appeared on any stage for many a year. Its scenes and incidents, with only the slightest revision, might well serve for a comic opera of the present day. This Oriental melodrama, *Ali Pacha; or, The Signet Ring*,[20] was presented at Covent Garden, October 19, 1822, and at the Park Theater, New York, May 8, 1823.

The French *Ali-Pacha* has the following cast:

Ali-Thébélen, pacha de Janina.
Ismail, pacha général du sultan.

---

[20] From *Ali-Pacha*, mélodrame en trois actes et a [sic] grand spectacle, par Mm. Hyacinthe [François Isaac Hyacinthe de Comberousse] et Alfred [Michel Pichat]; représenté pour la première fois sur le Théâtre du Panorama Dramatique, le 9 Juillet, 1822. Paris, 1822.

Sélim, petit-fils d'Ali.
Xénocles, citoyen de Souli.
Stephano, Albanais, chef des troupes d'Ali.
Mouctar, noir attaché à Ali.
Zadir, soldat attaché à Sélim.
Zélidé, mère de Selim.
Héléna, fille de Xénocles.
Une femme de Janina.
Odalisques, femmes et enfans de Janina.
Soldats d'Ismail, Soldats d'Ali.
La scène se passe en Epire, près de la ville de Janina.

The curtain rises upon the burning city of Janina; in the background is a fortress in the middle of a lake. Ali-Pacha, rebellious subject of the Sultan, has sacked the city and put it to the torch. He is now retreating to his citadel in the lake at the approach of Ismail, commander of the army of the Sultan. Before embarking, Ali gives orders to Mouctar to drown Héléna, beloved of Sélim, his grandson. But Sélim, suspecting foul play, rescues the girl, and before they can escape Ismail and his army are upon them. A grand tableau brings this act to a close. The fleet of Ali appears in the middle of the lake, the cannon from the fortress saluting his return. In the foreground Héléna is kneeling before Ismail, while Tartars hold their sabres over the head of Sélim.

The second act takes place on a rich portico of the citadel, the harem in the background. Sélim and Héléna have returned; the generous Ismail released them when he learned that Ibrahim, his father, captured by Ali, was alive in the fortress. Now Xénocles, a Greek patriot disguised as a Suliote chief, arrives upon the scene. He has joined the army of Ismail to seek revenge upon Ali, who has slain his wife and children. Xénocles meets Stephano, commander of Ali's troops, and they plot to kill Ali. But Héléna has overheard them. When she informs Ali of the plot, Xénocles casts off his disguise and states his true errand. Then Ali, pointing to Héléna, tells Xénocles that his informer is his own daughter, whom Xénocles believed slain. He may have his freedom on condition that he join his Greek

forces with those of Ali in an attempt to take Constantinople. To cement their compact the capricious Ali, forgetting his command that the girl be drowned in the first act, requires the marriage of Sélim and Héléna. Xénocles spurns these infamous proposals and is led away, with Stephano, to be executed. After Zadir announces that the heads of Ali's two sons are nailed to the gates of Constantinople, the curtain falls upon a tableau.

The third act takes us into the interior of the citadel, an esplanade and battlements in the background. Ali, fearing a revolt of his troops, has stayed the execution of Stephano; apparently Xénocles has also profited by this order. But the wily Ali feels his power waning and exacts from Sélim a promise to blow up the citadel whenever he shall send his signet-ring as a signal. Stephano then appears and demands the plunder taken in the sack of Janina. Ali gives him the ring and tells him to take it to Sélim, if he will have the treasure.

The scene changes to the cellar of the arsenal. Stephano delivers the ring to Sélim, who seizes the torch and starts toward the powder barrels. But Zélidé restrains him. At this juncture Ali enters pursued by Xénocles, who shoots him. The dying Ali fires into a powder barrel and blows up the citadel. A general combat ensues in which Ali's men are vanquished. Xénocles appears in the midst of the ruins, surrounded—*mirabile dictu*—by the women and children of Janina. Greece is saved.

Payne turns this three-act French melodrama into a play of two acts with three scenes each. He wisely omits Zélidé, mother of Sélim and daughter-in-law of Ali, for he later intends to show that Sélim is a Greek. For no apparent reason he renames two characters, Stephano becoming Talathon, and Zadir Hassan. Héléna becomes the sister instead of the daughter of Xénocles, who has no slain children to be avenged.

The adaptation is more melodramatic and a little less spectacular than its model. The French play contains no *niais*, according to Pixerécourt, one of the four indispensable elements of melodrama. Payne creates one in Hassan (Zadir renamed), who pretends to be a stupid, drunken fellow that he may watch over the fortunes of the hero and heroine. It is he, instead of Sélim, who rescues Héléna in the first act. The better to achieve

his purpose, Payne sometimes gives him lines belonging to Sélim. Besides creating a *niais*, in the last scene Payne introduces papers which attest the Greek parentage of Sélim, who is the kidnapped son of a Macedonian chieftain and heir to the stolen treasure of Ali.

Payne avoids the ambitious tableaux of the French piece, but the last scene—the blowing up of the citadel—could not be omitted. Payne makes cuts, transposes scenes, and invents situations at will, and thereby increases the effect of melodrama.

No doubt the play gained some popularity because there was an historical Ali-Pacha, and because the Greeks were at this time at war with the Turks. Genest, after stating that the melodrama might please in representation, but that it has not much to recommend it for perusal, transcribes the following from the preface to an 1825 edition of the play:

> Ali Pacha, the hero of this piece, was a very remarkable man—he was introduced to the notice of western Europe by the determined stand he made against the power of the Porte, and also by the great notice taken of him by European travellers, particularly Lord Byron—though anything rather than a friend to freedom, in any shape, he yet must be considered as the person who principally contributed, not intentionally indeed, to the present struggle of the Greeks for independence—his death did not occur as here represented.[21]

Payne's next adaptation, *The Two Galley Slaves; or, The Mill of St. Aldervon*,[22] made its first appearance at Covent Garden, November 6, 1822, and at the Park Theater, October 27, 1823. Payne's defection from the rival London theater apparently stung its sluggish manager into unwonted activity; for Genest records another version brought out at Drury Lane on the same night that Payne's adaptation was presented at Covent Garden.[23]

Les deux Forçats, the most successful of the melodramas of Boirie,[24] has the following characters:

---

[21] *Some Account of the English Stage*, Vol. 9, p. 192.

[22] From *Les deux Forçats, ou la Meunière du Puy-de-Dôme*, mélodrame en trois actes, par Mm. Boirie, Carmouche et Poujol; représenté, pour la première fois, sur le théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, le 3 octobre, 1822. In *Chefs-d'œuvre du Répertoire des Mélodrames*. Paris, 1825.

[23] "Elliston finding that the *Two Galley Slaves* was to be brought out at C. G. with a considerable expectation of success, procured a copy of the French piece, and had it translated in the greatest hurry possible—by this manœuvre he was able to bring it out at D. L. on the same night as the other piece at C. G." Vol. 9, p. 199.

[24] Ginisty, p. 167.

François, meunier.
M. Deville, son oncle.
Antoine Perrot, frère de Thérèse.
Thérèse, meunière.
M. Martin, maître des postes.
Un Inconnu.
Jean Lablanc, garçon meunier.
Louis, fils de Thérèse.
Une Paysanne.
Claude, paysan.
Paysans, paysannes.
La scène est en Auvergne en 17...

François, the miller, is honored and respected by all the village, although no one knows from whence he has come. To-day he has espoused Thérèse, who, loving him, has no need of knowing his name. The usual fête is prepared. A large transparency with the letters T F hangs in the center of the stage. These two letters have caused François much painful reflection. In the midst of the preparations the Unknown, a criminal escaped from the galleys, obtrudes upon the happy scene. He recognizes François, who gives him money and begs him to leave. But the convict is not satisfied; he must try his hand once before he departs. François discovers him in the act of forcing the desk of Thérèse. They struggle, and François is wounded. When the miller's arm is bared, the fatal letters, T F (*travaux forcés*), which stand for penal servitude, are found branded there.

At last his secret is known. He must return to a life of ignominy and shame. But in the nick of time Derville arrives to save the hero. It is true; François has been a galley slave, but he is innocent. In his devotion to his brother, guilty of embezzlement, he accepted the blame and suffered the punishment. The Unknown now makes a final attempt to ruin the honest man, though his vindictiveness is not explained. He reveals the true name of François; but his revelation serves only to strengthen the position of the injured man. Derville is delighted to discover a long-lost nephew to tell him that his

dying brother confessed his guilt and absolved his brother. He produces the papers of reinstatement. Henceforth François must share his uncle's heart and fortune.

Payne borrows plot, situations, and stage business. He makes a few minor alterations and transposes scenes to accord with the change in his second act. His adaptation contains only two acts instead of the original three; he makes the third act of the French piece the second scene of his second act. This change is an improvement, for the action is continuous. Both plays contain only a few expressions of generous sentiments and hardly any moralizings. Payne's rendering of rustic colloquialisms, as always, is well done.

Every character has been rechristened in the adaptation, but the names of only the hero and heroine are important. In order to achieve the effect of the fatal letters, T F, in the French scene, Payne was constrained to name his hero and heroine Henry and Louise that the letters on the transparency might correspond with the H L (hard labor) on his hero's arm. His most significant alteration is the saving of the hero's painful secret for the final denouement. In Act 2, Scene 3, of the original Thérèse guesses the mystery. Her husband neither affirms nor denies her assertions, but falls into her arms. Payne's alteration creates a little more suspense.

Payne's *Clari*, in which the song, "Home, Sweet Home," first appeared, offers an interesting study in the growth and development of a tale which had caught the popular fancy. *Clari; or, The Maid of Milan*, an opera in three acts, was first performed at Covent Garden, May 8, 1823, and at the Park Theater, New York, November 12, 1823. The music was by Henry R. Bishop, the songs and dialogue by Payne, and the story, we might add, by Marmontel (1722–99).

The story of *Clari* had been common property for more than half a century. Gaiffe states that "Les *Contes Moraux* de Marmontel, ont été, suivant le mot de Desnoiresterres, 'le grand grenier où les auteurs dramatiques venaient s'approvisionner.' M. Lenel ne cite pas moins de vingt-quatre pièces qui en ont été tirées; encore sa liste est-elle incomplète."[25] It was "Laurette,"

[25] *Le Drame en France*, pp. 456–57.

one of the *Contes Moraux* of Marmontel, that appears to have furnished the greatest attraction to the dramatic authors who followed him.

The "Laurette" of Marmontel is a tale of seduction which ends by a marriage. The Count de Luzy, attending a *bal champêtre*, is charmed by the grace and beauty of a young peasant girl. After dancing with her, he sketches a clever and alluring picture of the fashionable life of Paris. Eight days pass, during which Laurette finds the rough tasks of the field growing most irksome. At a second meeting the young girl resists less firmly the Count's ardent pleadings. A few days later Bazile, the father of Laurette, ruined by a hailstorm which destroyed his crops, is saved by a generous, but not disinterested, gift of the Count. At a last interview before his return to Paris, the Count de Luzy makes such frantic protestations of his love for Laurette that the young girl, overcome by emotion, falls into a swoon. When she comes to, Laurette finds herself in a coach en route for Paris. After some moments of remorse, she finally resigns herself to the raptures of love and the charms of pleasure.

In the meantime the goodman Bazile is desolated. Too proud to inform others of his trouble, he is unable to discover a trace of his daughter. But a chance trip to Paris helps him in his quest. There he discovers Laurette in a sumptuous equipage. He goes to her apartments, awakens in her all the good sentiments which love had put to sleep, and profits by the absence of the Count to lead her back to his village. While Luzy, furious at finding an empty nest, vainly seeks for his lost bird, the poor Laurette leads a heavy life, in which the knowledge of duty fulfilled badly recompenses the memory of joys departed. At length Count de Luzy discovers his pretty mistress and vainly begs her to return with him to Paris. Poor Bazile arrives upon the scene and delivers against the seducer one of those tirades of sentiment proper to the eighteenth century. Finally, touched and regenerated, the Count decides to forget his rank and humbly asks for the hand of Laurette. His request is granted.

Dramatic writers seized upon this story, most of them making

their piece begin with the elopement accomplished. Thus this sentimental love story was told and retold upon the stage without any apparent diminution in public interest. It finally received an embellishment which no doubt added to its popularity. A short play was inserted, usually in the second act and sometimes in pantomime, introducing the characters of a nobleman, an old farmer, his wife, and his daughter. The purpose of this brief play within a play was to mirror forth the main action and to describe the incidents which led to the elopement of the heroine.

It was, however, none of the earlier versions of this story of Laurette which Payne followed in writing *Clari*. In 1820 was performed at Paris *Clari, ou la Promesse de Mariage*, a ballet-pantomime in three acts by Milon.[26] This piece was published in the same year. Payne's "opera" is based upon the directions which he found in the printed ballet-pantomime of Milon. According to Gabriel Harrison, Payne first wrote a drama on this theme which he entitled *Angioletta;* but as he was unable to secure a production for the drama, he "changed the plot somewhat, and introduced several songs and duets, after which it was immediately brought out as an opera at Covent Garden with prodigious success."[27]

Guided by his French model, Payne wrote the dialogue and the songs expressive of the action of the ballet-pantomime. His song, "Home, Sweet Home," was not introduced as a mere diversion; it is in full accord with the action of the piece and the sentiments of the singer. A casual reading of the play will convince the reader that the sentiment of this popular song is not only quite *apropos*, but that it was probably inspired by the theme of the piece.

Payne followed the French original pretty closely, even

---

[26] *Clari, ou la Promesse de Mariage*, Ballet-Pantomime en trois actes; représentée, pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le théâtre de l'Académie Royale de Musique, le Lundi 19 juin, 1820. Par L-J. Milon. Paris, 1820.

[27] *Life of John Howard Payne*, p. 106.

translating the few lines to be spoken in the pantomime.[28] He omits four scenes in the first act, however, and transposes several scenes in the last act without changing their character. His play within the play follows Milon's piece faithfully. By the introduction of several songs and duets Payne was persuaded to call his piece an "opera."[29]

It might be worth while here to note Payne's knowledge of the *convenances* of his audiences. He felt that he owed something to the sensibilities of the English and American public. In the first act of the French pantomime the directions call for a magnificent apartment with a door to the left leading into the bedroom of Clari, and on the right a door leading to the apartments of the Duke. Payne admits the first part of the directions —his door to the left opens "into the bedroom of Clari"— but the door to the right is "the general entrance to the apartment." That this slight change in setting was not unintentional can be proved by a comparison of the endings of both pieces. In the French pantomime Clari is no longer innocent; the Duke has made her his mistress by a promise of marriage. In Payne's opera the Duke tells Clari's outraged father, "Your daughter is innocent. She was lured from home by my promise of marriage. . . . I would have deceived her, but her virtue was triumphant, and she fled." Thus what Payne lost in art he gained in virtue.

Clari, the ballet-pantomime of Milon, became *Clari*, the melodrama, of Payne, by a quite natural process of dramatic evolution. Of the many influences that combined to evolve the melodrama, the pantomime was by no means the least important. Gaiffe considers the *pantomime dialoguée* the precursor of melodrama. Hartog has briefly traced the history of this *genre*.

---

[28] In the pantomime Clari is to speak these words:

"Je puis braver les coups du sort, mais non pas les regards d'un père; pour m'exposer à sa colère, non, mon cœur n'est pas assez fort."

Payne makes her say:

"I can brave the shocks of fate, but not a father's eye; to expose myself to his wrath— No, no! my heart's not strong enough for that."

[29] That Payne's revival of this well-worn story was not the last is proved by the appearance of a *Clary, Dramma per Musica in tre atti;* représentée, pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le Théâtre Royal Italien, salle Favart, le 8 décembre, 1828. This piece, an Italian opera written to be sung in its entirety, was published in French and Italian as a libretto in Paris, 1828.

Vers la fin du 18e siècle, Nicolet qui avait fondé une troupe d'acteurs, les *Grands Danseurs du Roi*, et qui avait acclimaté sur les boulevards les anciens spectacles des foires, faisait jouer sur son théâtre des pantomimes, telles que *l'Histoire de la Pucelle*, le *Siège d'Orléans*, etc.

Dans ces pantomimes, chaque geste, chaque sentiment était traduit par une phrase musicale rendant avec exactitude le sens de l'action, qui se développait ainsi avec plus de clarté et de rapidité.

Un peu plus tard, Audinot au théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique faisait jouer des pantomimes; mais ces pantomimes avaient ceci de particulier qu'elles étaient parlées et dialoguées. Audinot eut l'idée de traduire les gestes et les sentiments des acteurs par des paroles, la musique ne suffisant pas à rendre claire au public l'action des personnages. Ceci n'est plus de la pantomime. C'est un drame plein d'action mêlé de ballets et de musique. C'est ce qu'on appellera plus tard une "féerie" si le sujet est fantasque et léger. Mais si l'action est sombre et tragique, si la musique et les ballets n'ont qu'un rôle secondaire, ce genre sera intitulé "mélodrame."[30]

Payne's next effort at adaptation resulted in his best and most popular comedy. *Charles the Second: or, The Merry Monarch* [31] was produced for the first time at Covent Garden, May 27, 1824, and at the Park Theatre, October 24, 1824.

Lenient characterizes Duval as a writer of comedy. "Duval aborde, mêle et brouille un peu tous les genres avec cette humeur aventureuse et vagabonde qu'il apporte dans sa vie."[32] *La Jeunesse de Henry V* was a brilliant success. Duval received his idea from Sébastien Mercier's comedy, *Charles II en un certain lieu* (1789). This piece in turn goes back to a German original, according to the critic Geoffroy; but Duval believed its ultimate source was English. Among other hardships which Duval's comedy endured before it attained its final form, Lenient enumerates those which a strict censorship imposed, and which may be worth quoting, inasmuch as the vigilant Genest finds somewhat similar anachronisms in the adaptation. To quote from Lenient:

---

[30] *Guilbert de Pixerécourt*, pp. 78–79.

[31] From *La Jeunesse de Henri V*, comédie en trois actes, par M. Alexandre Duval; représenté, pour la première fois, sur le Thèâtre-Français, le 9 juin, 1806. In *Suite du Répertoire du Théâtre Français*. Paris, 1823.

[32] *La Comédie en France*, Vol. 1, p. 118.

Il fallut compter avec la censure: car le titre primitif était *Charles II*. "Mais Charles II avait succédé à Cromwell, et nos zélés ennemis craignaient que ce nom ne fit penser à leur maître, au Cromwell qui nous gouvernait alors (1806)." A la place de Charles II, Duval imagina de mettre Henri V. Mais ce nouveau titre de *la Jeunesse de Henri V* réveillait le souvenir d'une terrible concurrence, celle de Shakespeare, qui avait traité le même sujet avec tant d'éclat. De plus, le changement de nom et d'époque exposait l'auteur à des anachronismes trop visibles pour échapper au regard de la critique. Rochester, le spirituel courtisan de Charles II, se trouvait associé à Henri V là où la tradition historique et littéraire réclaimait le personnage de Falstaff. La montre, qui joue un rôle si important, était une chose inconnue du temps de Henri V. Enfin l'usage du punch dans la taverne de Copp offrait un autre genre d'anachronisme avant la découverte de l'Amerique. Duval répond, dans sa préface, à toutes ces critiques dont il reconnaît la justesse, et en renvoie la responsabilité à la censure, qui l'a forcé de supprimer Charles II.[1]

The final revision of Duval's comedy contains the following characters:

Henri, héritier présomptif de la couronne d'Angleterre.
Rochester, favori du Prince.
Édouard, page du Prince.
Copp, capitaine de corsaire, tenant une taverne.
William, valet de chambre du Prince.
Miladi Clara, favorite de la princesse.
Betty, nièce de Copp.
La scène est dans le palais du prince et la taverne de Copp.

Lady Clara, in love with Rochester but grieved by his wild escapades with the young prince, promises him her hand if he will reform and at the same time make an effort to restrain his pleasure-loving master. Rochester accepts her proposal and assures her that he will make the attempt. When the page Édouard confesses his love for a beautiful young girl, niece of the old tavern-keeper Copp, a former captain of a privateer, Rochester resolves upon a plan to teach the gay young prince lesson. That night the prince and Rochester, disguised as ilors, pay a visit to the tavern of the old sea captain.

1 *die en France*, Vol. 1, pp. 131–132.

There is a gay scene at the tavern, in which the innocent gallantries of the prince excite the jealous fears of Édouard, who now sees the results of his imprudent confession of love. Captain Copp, his tongue loosened by wine, reveals the fact that Betty is the niece to Rochester. But it is high time that the lesson begin. Having relieved the prince of his purse, Rochester takes his leave, making signs to Copp that his friend will pay. When the tavern-keeper presents his score, Prince Henri is unable to pay and offers his valuable watch as a pledge. But a common sailor is not in the habit of carrying a watch studded with diamonds. The honest captain thinks he has caught a thief. He locks the prince in the tavern while he goes for the officers. With the connivance of Édouard and Betty, Prince Henri escapes from the window.

The next morning Copp and Betty appear at the palace to restore the watch to its rightful owner. The astonishment of the brave captain when he sees the two sailors of the night before dressed in the rich habits of great lords, and the little music teacher himself in the costume of a page furnishes a series of delightful turns in the final scene. Rochester is grudgingly forgiven for his share in the last night's adventure, for Lady Clara has befriended him by securing in advance a pardon from the prince for an offending author. Prince Henri returns his watch to Captain Copp for his faithfulness and sets his seal of approval upon the love of Betty and Édouard.

In the preface to his first edition of *Charles the Second* Payne says:

> I understand that the authorship of this comedy has been claimed by different persons in the public papers, on the ground of their having produced translations of the French original, which have been performed at the minor theaters. In reply to this I would observe that I have never seen any of these translations. My play was written last autumn [1823] at Paris. It was founded on a printed copy of *La Jeunesse de Henri V*, of which a number of editions have appeared. The incidents and situations are nearly the same, but the dialogue differs essentially throughout; especially in the part of Captain Copp. I am not aware that the circumstance of one person's having translated a foreign play for any individual theater gives him an exclusive property in the original play. I believe foreign plays are considered open to any one to

alter and adapt according to his taste and ability; and, after all, the honour of a translation or adaptation, is a matter very little worth contending for.

But, while I totally disclaim all benefits from contemporary translations, I must advert to material advantages which I have received from other sources, and I regret that I am restrained from acknowledging them except in general terms. My manuscript has been revised by a literary friend to whom I am indebted for invaluable touches; and the songs were supplied, during my absence, by, as I am informed, "a very amiable and accomplished young lady," whose concealment of her name shows that her modesty is equal to her merit.

London, J. H. P.

June 5, 1824.

Payne renamed only two characters in his adaptation, and omitted the superfluous character William, valet to the Prince. Betty is rechristened Mary, and Charles II is restored to his proper place in the comedy. With the restoration of the King, Payne naturally obtained a certain advantage over the French author. Payne's second act contains two scenes; the scene outside the tavern is not found in the original. Duval's comedy contains no songs. There are three songs for Mary in the adaptation, and one broadly humorous song for Copp, which he never succeeds in finishing.

It is in the character of the bluff Captain Copp, good in the French piece but racier in the English, with his choice seamen's expressions and quaint oaths; in the blundering yet clever love-making of the King, the gracious, careless, nonchalant lover, less serious in the adaptation than in Duval, that we suspect the "invaluable touches" of a "literary friend." This literary friend was Washington Irving, to whom Payne makes a grateful bow in his dedication of *Richelieu*, another adaptation to which Irving lent a hand.

Genest's brief criticism of *Charles II* is entertaining. "There are some improprieties in it—Rochester speaks of his castle at Rochester—he had no castle at that place, his seat was in Oxfordshire—Odsfish, the King's usual oath, is given to Copp instead of the King;—Mary makes the tea for the King and Rochester—in the time of Charles II, it is improbable that tea should be met in a public house at Wapping—it is still more improbable that

Mary should make tea late at night—the King and Rochester do not start for their frolic till 9 o'clock."[34]

Duval furnished Payne with his next adaptation, which was as unfortunate as his last was happy. The original title of Payne's version was *Richelieu, a Domestic Tragedy*;[35] but the play gave umbrage to the French Ambassador, a descendant of the great duke, and his influence secured its suppression. Charles Kemble then brought it out at Covent Garden, February 11, 1826, as *The French Libertine*, in which Richelieu ceded his place to the "Duke de Rougement." However, the piece did not succeed; for its merits were quite inferior to those of the last adaptation, and circumstances were unfavorable to its reception. Payne's adaptation was printed in New York in 1826 under its first title, and it was first played in America at the Chestnut Street Theater, Philadelphia, in 1829.[36]

Duval's play as first printed was entitled a *comédie*, but in Lepeintre's collection of 1823 it is called a *drame*. Its title is somewhat misleading. To quote Lenient on this point:

> Ce personnage [Richelieu], resté plus fameux par ses aventures galantes que par ses exploits guerriers, semblait une incarnation vivante des grâces et des vices de l'ancienne cour. On pouvait s'attendre à retrouver là le debraillé spirituel, la dépravation élégante de la Régence, toutes les extravagances d'un monde qui n'a d'autre dieu et d'autre passion que le plaisir. L'attente fut singulièrement trompée. Au lieu d'une comédie vive, alerte, étincelante d'esprit et de gaieté, telle que le sujet paraissait le comporter, nous avons un mélodrame sentimental qui ne prête guère au rire: le supplice d'une femme adultère et vertueuse à la fois, qui est seule à se sentir coupable, quand tout le monde l'entoure de respect, de considération, et son mari plus que personne.[37]

The characters in the French play are:

Le Duc de Richelieu.
Armand, son secrétaire.

---

[34] *Some Account of the English Stage*, Vol. 9, p. 257.

[35] From *La Jeunesse du Duc de Richelieu ou le Lovelace Français*, drame en cinq actes par M. A. Duval et feu Monvel [Jacques Marie Boutet de]; représenté, pour la première fois, au Théâtre-Français, en décembre, 1796. In *Suite du Répertoire du Théâtre Français*. Paris, 1823.

[36] See Quinn, p. 183.

[37] *La Comédie en France*, Vol. 1, p. 127.

M. Michelin, marchand de meubles dans le faubourg Saint-Antoine.
Mme. Michelin, son épouse.
Mme. Renaud, veuve d'un bourgeois, et amie de Mme. Michelin.
Marie, vieille cuisinière chez M. Michelin.
La Fosse, valet-de-chambre du duc de Richelieu.
Un Laquais.

La scène se passe à Paris, chez M. Michelin, à l'hôtel de Richelieu, et dans la petite maison de ce seigneur.

Richelieu, disguised as La Fosse, had insinuated himself into the home of Michelin, a humble dealer in furniture, considerably older than his wife but beloved by her. He was so engaging and offered such a sprightly contrast to the modest Michelin that he was welcomed by both. In time Richelieu achieved the purpose of his visits. By his wiles he tricked the unsuspecting wife to his palace where he violated her honor on the eve of his departure for Flanders. All this information we are given by Madame Michelin in the first act, as, in despair, she confesses her great misfortune to the old servant Marie.

The action begins with Richelieu's return from his campaign, covered with glory. By means of the true La Fosse, he announces his return to Paris and states his intention of calling at the home of Michelin within a few hours. Though the injured woman spurns his attentions, the Duke is diabolically persistent. When he calls, the poor wife fears to reveal his identity, for her care is all for the peace of mind and honor of her husband. Armand, who plays the part of the chorus, commenting on the action, tries to dissuade the Duke from his wild adventures, but without success. The terrible seducer finally breaks the heart and will of Madame Michelin. She is abducted and taken again to his apartments—this time to his country house in the suburbs. Here she meets Madame Renaud whose jealous curiosity has led her thither. The timid, modest figure of Madame Michelin, struggling with remorse and her own conscience, is contrasted with the bold and majestic Madame Renaud, who, though jealous of the Duke's attentions, be-

friends the unfortunate woman. She secures the aid of Armand, who conducts Madame Michelin to her home in a driving storm. Richelieu, having followed them, is at last denounced by the faithful wife as she expires in her husband's arms. Apparently distressed by the ruin he has caused, Richelieu leaves the house in despair.

Payne renames all the characters except Richelieu in his domestic tragedy; but he makes only one important change. Madame Renaud becomes the Countess Fleury; thus he succeeds in heightening the effect of rivalry between the two women. By this change he also is able to make more of a situation that contains elements of humor. For example, at the end of the second act he develops with greater effect the scene in which Richelieu chides the Countess for being unceremoniously bowed out of the home of Dorival (Michelin renamed), a mere bourgeois.

In dramatic effect Payne seems to improve upon his model. The French piece contains tiresome speeches filled with generous sentiments which Payne invariably reduces. The slow, cruel agony of the suffering wife fills almost all of the last act. Payne mercifully cuts this down. In Duval's fourth act, Richelieu expects the two women at his house in the suburbs. Payne sticks closer to probability and has the Duke expect only Madame Dorival, brought there by deception. The greatest change, however, lies in Payne's attempt to make the betrayed wife wholly the victim of circumstance, resistant but unsuccessful.

The heartless, disdainful egoism in the character of Richelieu is softened somewhat by the adaptor. Payne keeps the Duke on the scene to the end and rings down the curtain on his exclamation, "Horror! Horror!" Duval sends him out before the end and lets the moralist speak. Armand ends the play with "Et voila donc l'abîme où peut nous plonge un seul moment de faiblesse et d'erreur."

The sufferings of the unhappy heroine of *Richelieu* are reminiscent of the misfortunes of the heroine in *Adeline*, a piece which met a somewhat similar fate.

Payne's last acted borrowing from the French to survive was

a very light farce, *'Twas I; or, The Truth a Lie*,[38] which was first presented at Covent Garden, December 3, 1825, and at the Park Theater, New York, May 20, 1826. Genest calls it an "Operatick Piece," and says it was acted "about twenty times" during the season.[39]

The characters of the French *comédie* are:

Mathurin, fermier.
Mathurine, sa femme.
Justine, sa cousine.
Bastien, jardinier.
Madame Bertrand, vieille voisine.

Mathurin, the farmer, has taken a lively fancy to his cousin Justine. Rising early one morning, he finds her in the garden picking cherries. He pulls her from the ladder, she all the while mildly resisting. Then he wheels her about on a wheelbarrow and offers to assist her in filling a watering-pot. As he puts his arm about her she accidentally spills the water over him. He next attempts to pin a rose on her, and finally kisses her. All this time Madame Bertrand has been watching them from her window next door. She now slams down the window with violence, and the guilty pair fear her tongue. They separate.

When Mathurine appears, her husband goes through the very same performance with her. He also advises Justine to do the same with Bastien, her lover. Having taken these precautions, Mathurin and Justine are prepared for the accusations of Madame Bertrand. She soon appears to accuse the farmer and his young cousin; but after each speech of the angry spinster, Mathurine and Bastien may now answer *c'etoit moi*, and with truth. The two innocent characters join with the guilty pair in jeering Madame Bertrand off the scene. Mathurine, the wife, is not fully convinced, however, and compels her husband to acquiesce in the early marriage of Bastien and Justine.

---

[38] From *C'Etoit Moi*, comédie en un acte, imitée de l'allemand de Kotzebue, par Boursault, Jean François dit Malherbe; représenté, pour la première fois, sur le théâtre des Variétés-Étrangères, le 25 mai, 1807. Paris, 1807.

[39] *Some Account of the English Stage*, Vol. 9, p. 345.

Payne borrows the main plot and some of the episodes of this one-act comedy and constructs a two-act farce. He introduces three new characters—the Mayor, the Town Clerk, and the Marchioness—and adds several scenes not in the original. Briefly, the outline of Payne's farce runs thus: The Marchioness de Merivale has decreed that each year an election shall be held at the Town Hall to choose the most innocent girl of fifteen years, one who has never been known "to have committed with the opposite sex, even the indiscretion of a kiss." The maid thus chosen shall be crowned publicly with a wreath of white roses, and to her the Marchioness will grant a marriage dot of 100 crowns. Georgette Clairville (Justine renamed) wins the prize. Madame Mag (Madame Bertrand renamed) is disappointed because her niece has not won the prize. She vows revenge. This is all Payne's invention. He introduces a chorus at the beginning and end of this scene.

Payne's next scene is adapted from the French; however, only the idea and some of the episodes are borrowed. The stage business is much the same. As in the French piece, the farmer comes into the garden and behaves indiscreetly with his cousin, finally kissing her. The spinster next door surprises them from her window. To thwart the plans of his indignant neighbor, the farmer goes through the same performances with his wife. This scene in the French piece is more ingenious and contains more humorous incidents. The young girl, to hide the truth from her lover Marcel (Bastien renamed), makes him promise to answer to whatever question anyone may ask him with the phrase "'Twas I." Thus she hopes to outwit her neighbor and win the prize. This is a simplification of the French plot, in which the cousin, at the suggestion of the farmer, rehearses the same scene with her lover which the farmer rehearsed with his wife. Consequently, when Madame Mag comes to denounce the farmer and his cousin before all the villagers to prevent Georgette from getting the prize, she is discomfited by the reply "'Twas I," by wife and lover. Madame Mag is driven off the scene and Georgette receives the prize.

Payne borrowed the French plot and amplified it, but he by no means improved upon it. His amplification was made

largely that he might have a better reason for introducing several songs and a chorus.

On the title page of the French piece it is stated that the *comédie* is imitated from the German of Kotzebue. This imitation must evidently have been made from one of the fugitive pieces of that fecund dramatic writer; for its original is not listed in the almost complete bibliography of Kotzebue made by Rabany,[40] nor is it to be found in Sellier's dissertation.[41]

Among the several adaptations that have at various times been attributed to Payne, the two tragedies, *Mahomet* and *Sylla*, are the most important.

Mahomet: a tragedy in five acts, translated from the French of M. Voltaire by the Rev. James Miller, was printed in New York in 1809. This adaptation was first produced in America at the Chestnut Street Theater, Philadelphia, December 11, 1811. Payne, then a young man of twenty, played Zaphna. It is this 1809 edition of Miller's translation of Voltaire's *Le Fanatisme*, a translation first made in 1744, that has sometimes been ascribed to Payne. As a matter of fact, the *Mahomet* printed in New York is a faithful reprint, even to the prologue and epilogue, of the British version of 1796. The only alterations, which might have been made in some other British version, are the marking with inverted commas of a few passages to be omitted in representation.

Sylla, a tragedy in five acts, by E. Jouy, translated from the French and adapted for representation at the Chatham Theater "by a Citizen of New York," was printed in New York in 1827. This tragedy cannot reasonably be ascribed to Payne. It was printed five years before his return from abroad; and, indeed, if he had made the translation, he would first have attempted to present it in London.

The American *Sylla* is a faithful, but not slavish, line-for-line translation from the French play, which obtained a *succès d'estime* in Paris in 1821. This historical tragedy belongs to the classical French period; it scrupulously observes the three unities

---

[40] Charles Rabany, *Kotzebue: sa vie et son temps*. Paris, 1893.

[41] W. Sellier, *Kotzebue in England* (University of Leipzig Ph.D. Thesis). Leipzig, 1901.

and contains the customary long speeches. The motivation is good and the characterization is strong, but its defect, fatal in this period, is a lack of action. The cast of characters, found in the translation as played at the Chatham Theater in 1827, includes such capable actors as J. B. Booth, Wallack, and T. Placide, and would indicate that the play was considered worthy of able and careful presentation. But the play came too late; classical dramas were not the fashion in 1827. This was the heyday of the melodrama and the eve of the romantic period.

During Payne's activities as an adaptor and before the appearance of *The Eighth of January*, Richard Penn Smith's first borrowing from the French, it seems that there were produced upon the American stage only two pieces from the French which have survived. These two pieces were *Nature and Philosophy* by "A Virginian," and *The Grecian Captive; or, The Fall of Athens* by M. M. Noah, who had had previous experience in adapting when in 1812 he made a version of Pixerécourt's *Le Pélerin blanc*.

Nature and Philosophy, by an anonymous author, was first presented at the Park Theater, New York, December 10, 1821. In his preface the adaptor states: "It is needless to mention whence the plot of *Nature and Philosophy* is taken—the story must be generally known. The author has added one scene and freely translated, and altered the rest from a French comic opera, written by Duport of Paris, and performed there for the first time, in 1818."[42]

The characters of the French piece are:

Frère Philippe.
Lubin, son Fils.
Anselme, Ami du Frère Philippe.
Élisa, Fille d'Anselme.
Gertrude, Gouvernante d'Élisa, ancienne Duègne de Mme. Philippe.
Troupe de Villageois et Villageoises.

[42] This was *Le Frère Philippe*, opéra-comique, en un acte, par M. Auguste Duport, Musique de M. V. Dourlen; représenté, pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le Théâtre Royal de l'Opéra-Comique, le 20 Janvier, 1818. Paris, 1818.

La scène se passe en Italie, dans un ancien château du Frère Philippe.

Philippe, with his son Lubin, is coming to live with his old friend Anselme. Fourteen years before, Philippe retired from the world to protect his young son from the wiles of woman. Now grown old and feeble and unable longer to live alone, Philippe has accepted Anselme's kind invitation to share his home, though not without many misgivings. For Anselme has a daughter of seventeen. It has been agreed, however, that the old nurse Gertrude is to be the first woman that Lubin shall meet. She is instructed to be very harsh and ill-tempered and to instil in the boy a loathing for her kind, but Élisa has overheard this plot and decides that it shall miscarry. Indeed, Gertrude herself intends not to carry out the wishes of the parents; but Lubin is so startled when he meets her that she becomes offended and treats him rudely. Then Élisa appears through a secret door and Lubin falls in love with her.

The American adaptor of this childish piece has added one scene and renamed two characters. Anselme becomes Ronaldo and Lubin becomes Colin. The first scene of the adaptation is not found in the original. Ronaldo visits Philip, who lives in a cave in the forest with his boy Colin. As Philip is growing old and infirm, Ronaldo invites him to his home, promising to keep his daughter Eliza from meeting Colin for a time. With this promise and also with the agreement that Gertrude, the ill-favored governess, shall treat Colin rudely, Philip accepts the invitation. For this scene the adaptor received hints from another scene in his French model. In setting and stage business the original is followed closely, but the rendering is free.

Both pieces are exceedingly flimsy in plot and structure. The French piece has really more excuse for being, since it was written in the main to be sung. It is a light operetta. The American adaptor had to rest content without music, as he tells us in a note: "These two verses were represented as a piece of dialogue, the contracted time for its production not admitting of music being composed for it. The same with all the poetry that follows." Without the aid of music one might well expect

the piece to fail; but it was acted in three different theaters in New York. It appears that American adaptors were willing to try anything.

The Grecian Captive, by M. M. Noah, was first acted at the Park Theater, New York, June 7, 1822. In the preface to his play Noah states, "We know the history of the fair Venetian, captured by Mahomet II, and sacrificed by him to appease the rage of his janissaries. The French have written a pretty melodrama on that subject, from which I borrow the incidents in the following piece."[43]

The French play has the following characters:

Mahomet II, Empereur des Turcs.
Paul Éritzo, Provéditeur de Négrepont, captif de Mahomet.
Anna Éritzo, fille du Provéditeur.
Bellini, jeune peintre vénitien.
Roberti, esclave vénitien, bouffon de Mahomet.
Achmet, Aga des Janissaries.
Osmin } Officiers de Janissaries.
Nadir }
Un Officier des Troupes du Sultan.
Le Chef des Eunuques.
Muets.
Suite de Mahomet.
Odalisques.
Vénitiens, Génois, Esclaves.

La scène se passe à Constantinople, dans le palais de Mahomet, en 1470, après la conquête de l'île de Négrepont, anciennement l'Eubée.

In Noah's adaptation the characters are renamed as follows:

Mahomet II ..... Ali Pacha
Paul Éritzo ..... Kiminski
Anna Éritzo ..... Zelia
Bellini ..... Demetrius Ypsilanti
Roberti ..... Roberto

[43] This was *Mahomet II, ou les Captifs Vénitiens*, drame héroique en trois actes par Charrin (Pierre Joseph) et Joseph [François Nicolas Dusaulchoy de Bergemont]. Paris, 1820.

Noah also invents two characters who are to figure in the denouement. They are Alexander Ypsilanti, leader of the Greek forces, and Burrows, an American officer. He changes the scene to Athens.

The Grecian Captive bears a striking resemblance to Payne's *Ali Pacha*, though it is not quite so incoherent and spectacular. Ali Pacha, the Mohammedan chieftain, is in love with his fair captive, Zelia, daughter of the Greek patriot, Kiminski. He has commanded Demetrius Ypsilanti, who is a captive known as Carlini, to paint her portrait. Zelia proves to be the long-lost love of Ypsilanti, who believed she had perished in the smoking ruins of Negropont. Achmet and Osmin strongly disapprove of Ali's love for a Christian, and plot to be rid of Zelia that Fatima, the former favorite, may once more control Ali and make h'm a true Mussulman.

In act two Kiminski is brought in a captive. Ali proposes to free him and the other Greeks if Zelia will consent to become his bride. Though Kiminski pleads with his daughter to refuse, she accepts Ali's proposal, resolving to stab herself immediately after the ceremony. The Janissaries are disappointed at the leniency of Ali.

In the third act Kiminski unites his daughter in marriage to Demetrius Ypsilanti. Roberto, the *niais* of the piece, gives Zelia some tablets upon which are written the plans for her escape. Ali surprises her reading the tablets and learns the plot. Zelia attempts to stab herself, but Kiminski and her husband prevent her. Then the Janissaries revolt and Ali is killed. The piece ends with the retaking of Athens by Alexander Ypsilanti, aided by the American officer Burrows, who covered the landing of the Greeks with the guns of his frigate, the "United States."

Noah has made quite a few alterations on his original. He transfers the scene from Constantinople in 1470 to Athens in 1820. The tyrant Mahomet becomes the contemporary brigand, Ali Pacha. The captive Venetians are changed to Greeks; and an American officer contributes substantial aid to the cause of Greek independence.

At this time American sympathy was strongly on the side of the Greeks, who were struggling desperately against Turkish

aggression. Noah expresses this feeling in his preface: "We citizens of a free country, cannot observe with indifference the present struggle for liberty in Greece. Though separated by a world of waters we are too familiar with the history of that country, with those illustrious events which mark the pages of her history, not to feel a deep interest in the success of that people, and the cause of freedom generally."

The marked similarity between the two French melodramas, *Mahomet II, ou les Captifs Vénitiens* and *Ali-Pacha*, is reflected in the American adaptations. The former piece was played and published two years before *Ali-Pacha* appeared, and it consequently furnished the inspiration for the authors of the latter play. But both melodramas derive from an older play, a tragedy by Lanoue, called *Mahomet II* and played for the first time at Paris on February 23, 1739. It contains a fair captive with whom Mahomet is in love. She is the daughter of a Greek patriot, and she consents to marry her captor, who spares her father's life; but when the Janissaries object to his marriage, Mahomet kills the gentle maid. Such a denouement was not fitting for the audiences of the early nineteenth century. The adaptors made the proper alterations.

In 1828, after many years of dramatic inactivity, Dunlap turned for the last time to the French to make his adaptation, *Thirty Years; or, The Life of a Gamester*.[44] The play is of no particular merit, but it is interesting in that it is a so-called "period play." Its action extends over a period of thirty years, with fifteen-year intervals between the second and third acts. It is perhaps the first period play made by an American. *Thirty Years; or, The Life of a Gamester* was first played at the Bowery Theatre, New York, on February 22, 1828. The play was not printed. The manuscript in the Yale University Library bears the name "A. Gilfert," and gives evidence of having been written by two different hands, the first and third acts by one hand, and the second by another. The second act is signed "Wm. Dunlap." The acts are not in sequence; the third follows

[44] From *Trente Ans, ou la Vie d'un Joueur*, mélodrame en trois journées, par Victor Ducange et M. Dinaux [Prosper Parfait Goubaux]; Musique de M. Alexandre Piccini. Représenté pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le théâtre de la Porte-Saint Martin, le 19 juin, 1827. Paris, 1829.

the first, and the second is placed at the end. The third act, of which the second, third, and fourth pages are misplaced, begins toward the end of the second scene in the French piece. The adaptation was evidently made in haste.

The principal characters of the French play follow:

M. de Germany, vieillard infirme et près du tombeau.
Georges de Germany, joueur, fils du précédent, âgé de vingt-cinq ans.
Warner, chevalier d'industrie, ami de Georges, âgé de vingt-six ans.
Dermont, negociant-armateur, oncle d'Amélie, âgé de quarante-cinq ans.
Rodolphe, âgé de vingt-deux ans.
Amélie, riche orpheline, fiancée de Georges, élevée chez M. de Germany, âgée de seize ans.
L'action de la première journée se passe en 1790.

This is a bourgeois tragedy with melodramatic effects. Georges de Germany is consumed with a passion for gaming. On the eve of his marriage to the youthful Amélie he loses a fortune. Dermont, Amélie's uncle, horrified to discover her future husband in a gaming house, resolves to prevent the wedding. But he arrives too late; Georges and Amélie are already married. When M. de Germany learns of his son's transgressions, he sketches his awful future and curses him as the curtain falls.

In the second act fifteen years have elapsed. Georges has become an inveterate gambler, ever pursued by the evil counsels of the profligate Warner, who covets Amélie. He has lost all his possessions; nothing remains but the sum set aside for their young son, Albert. By a ruse Georges obtains this money and loses it at play. He has now also become a forger and must flee the country. After killing his friend, Rodolphe, in a jealous fit, he escapes, taking Amélie with him.

Fifteen years later, Georges and Amélie, utterly destitute, are living in a hut on the Red Mountain in Switzerland. On the night before they are to be dispossessed, Albert, who has been reared by Dermont, comes to bring them aid. He bears

a pardon for his father; but he has come too late to save his unworthy parent. The dissolute Warner, now a vagrant, begs for shelter from the approaching storm, and then attempts to murder Albert. A bolt strikes the hut and sets it aflame. As the officers arrive to arrest Georges for a murder he has recently committed, he seizes Warner, his evil spirit, and rushes with him into the flames. The father's curse is fulfilled.

The American adaptation is a close rendering of its original, varied only by the occasional cutting down of long speeches. The names of the characters are retained with the exception of that of Georges de Germany, who becomes George St. Germain. The manuscript stage directions call for music, and in the third act for "thunder," "lightning," and "rain," and thus augment the effect of melodrama. The translation contains a slight alteration at the end. In the French piece Georges drags the malevolent Warner with him into the flames, crying "Viens! maintenant tu ne me quitteras plus! je te le jure par l'enfer!" The adaptation required a moral more pointed. George stabs Warner and then plunges the knife in his own breast, ending the play with "Forgive me Amelia! My son! See the miserable end of a Gamester."

IV

Plays Produced from 1829 to 1833

Richard Penn Smith began his career as an adaptor of French plays with *The Eighth of January*, first played at the Chestnut Street Theatre, Philadelphia, January 8, 1829. This adaptation represents a piece of theatrical opportunism quite unique in stage history. Taking a French melodrama, popular in Paris about two decades before, Smith made of it an ingenious adaptation to suit the affair of the moment. "It celebrated ostensibly Jackson's victory at New Orleans in 1815, but in reality it celebrated his triumph of 1828, and was consequently of deeper significance. Andrew Jackson had just been elected President of the United States, and, to a great majority of the people, he was the champion of popular government as opposed to the class government of which the 'Adams dynasty' was the symbol. The play represents, therefore, the dramatization of political feeling and belongs to social history."[1]

For this play, James N. Barker, himself a playwright of note, wrote a stirring prologue, filled with the praise of the redoubtable General Jackson and the glorification of America. It contains such lines as these:

> Although my countrymen may view tonight,
> No eastern tinsel glittering on the sight,
> And critic fops may sneer, and stand aloof,
> Because the fabric's western, web and woof—
> Americans who would be truly free,
> Will never scorn domestic *industry*.

It is quite true that the "fabric" of Smith's play was "western, web and woof"; but an eastern loom was borrowed for its weaving. Seizing upon a successful French melodrama[2] for his plot,

[1] Quinn, p. 207.

[2] *Le Maréchal de Luxembourg*, mélodrame en trois actes, a [sic] grand spectacle, par Mm. Frédéric et Boirie; représenté, pour la première fois, sur le Théâtre de la Gaîté, le samedi 26 septembre 1812. Paris, 1812.

Smith, by an adroit use of situations and a clever renaming of characters, produced a melodrama that had a premier performance to a thousand dollar house. But as its theme was purely occasional, its popularity quickly declined. Durang says, "The piece proved successful; it was acted the third night for the author's benefit, but the house was not good. . . . The Grand Jackson March and the Quickstep, composed for the Jackson Wreath, by Braun, seemed to have made more of a hit than the drama."[3]

The characters in *Le Maréchal de Luxembourg* are:

Henri de Bouteville, Maréchal de Luxembourg, commandant en chef l'armée française.
Le Comte de Saarbourg, général des alliés.
Mildem, meunier de Harberg, vieux militaire.
Charles, gendarme du régiment de Luxembourg, fils de Mildem.
Biribi, neveu de Mildem.
Adolphine, nièce de Mildem.
Brantz, capitaine des troupes alliés.
Fonville, colonel français.
Werther, colonel des alliés.
Un Sergent, allié.
Soldats français, soldats alliés.
Villageois, villageoises.
La scène se passe dans le 17e siècle sur les bords de l'Escaut.

Charles, son of the brave miller Mildem, is fighting under the banners of France. On the eve of a battle between the French and the allies he has left his post and broken through the enemy lines to visit his father. At the rise of the curtain Charles is discovered hiding behind a bush in his attempt to evade the pursuit of Captain Brantz and a squad of allied soldiers, who had been warned of his presence in their lines by Biribi, a cowardly cousin of Charles. Biribi is the comedian of the piece, but not the *niais*, for he does not second the honest efforts of

[3] *The Philadelphia Stage*, Second Series, Chapter 44.

the hero or heroine. While Brantz and his men are searching for Charles, the Comte de Saarbourg enters with his staff. He directs Colonel Werther to go to the headquarters of the Maréchal de Luxembourg to request an armistice of six hours for burying the dead. He also issues an order that all French soldiers caught in the allied lines shall be shot as spies. After the soldiers leave, Biribi receives a shock to find himself face to face with Charles, the man whom he had just reported as a spy; but the cousins do not recognize each other, for Charles has been absent from home for twelve years. As another detachment of allied soldiers is approaching, Charles, by a ruse, persuades Biribi to hold his rifle and to exchange shirts and hats. Believing the soldiers to be French, Biribi consents to make the change that he may avoid capture. Charles escapes, and the soldiers, who belong to the allied army, capture Biribi, but soon release him.

In the next scene the Maréchal de Luxembourg and Colonel Fonville, while reconnoitering, come upon Mildem. They question him. Modestly and fearlessly the miller gives only such answers as will not prove harmful to his country's cause. He is commended for his honest bravery. Then Charles enters to beg the Maréchal to save himself, for he is surrounded by the enemy. A skirmish ensues. The Maréchal is wounded in the arm. Charles fires his pistol to attract the guard to himself, and Mildem, who knows not the rank of his enemy, aids the Maréchal to escape to his mill. The curtain falls upon a tableau.

The Maréchal de Luxembourg is hidden in the mill. Mildem, on the order of the Comte de Saarbourg, has ground corn for the allies, his countrymen. The allied soldiers, looking for spies, search the mill and discover the Maréchal, though they do not recognize him. Captain Brantz brings in Charles a prisoner. The Comte tells him that he can save his life only by disclosing the plans of the French. Charles replies by asking to be led to the place of execution. Upon a hint from the Maréchal, Mildem begs for a three-hour respite for his son; for the Maréchal will surely be glad to exchange a superior officer for his brave boy. Colonel Werther now arrives with the armistice unsigned, having been unable to find the Maréchal de Luxembourg. He returns to the Comte de Saarbourg the papers which

already bear the signature of the allied commander. The Comte lays them on the table. But Colonel Werther has recognized the Maréchal and turns to the Comte to inform him. Here occurs the armistice incident.[4] The Maréchal glides swiftly to the table and affixes his signature to the paper. The Comte is chagrined. He tells Werther that the Maréchal has gained his freedom by a ruse, and by a ruse shall he be retained. The Maréchal and Charles are allowed to return to their own lines.

To reach the French lines, however, the Maréchal must recross the river Scheldt. Here Saarbourg has sprung his trap. He has destroyed the pontoon bridges and removed all the boats. Only a few men have ever succeeded in swimming the river, but a young lad accomplishes this feat, taking a note from the Maréchal to the French army. In less than an hour (only one hour of the six called for in the armistice remains) a bridge is thrown across the river, and the Maréchal crosses in time. Such are the triumphs of melodrama. Mildem has helped him to escape from his house, which is set on fire. In the battle that follows after the expiration of the armistice the French are victorious. The Maréchal ends the play with a brave speech on justice and honor.

For his play, Smith cleverly renames the characters of the French melodrama as follows:

Maréchal de Luxembourg	General Jackson
Colonel Fonville	Colonel Kemper
Comte de Saarbourg	General Packenham
Colonel Werther	Colonel Thornton
Brantz	McFuse
Mildem	John Bull
Charles	Charles
Biribi	Billy Bowbell
Adolphine	Charlotte

Smith makes the most adroit use of nearly every incident and situation in the French piece. He changes the battle be-

[4] It is this incident that furnished Payne with the central idea for his one-act comedy, *Peter Smink.*

tween the French and Alliés to the battle of New Orleans between the English and Americans. The noble and generous sentiments expressed by the Maréchal de Luxembourg are transferred to the lips of General Jackson. The honest and brave miller Mildem becomes John Bull, who, in his interview with Jackson, acquits himself with as much honor as Mildem with the Maréchal. The mean-spirited, cowardly braggart, Biribi, changes not his character as Billy Bowbell and suffers the same humiliations. Captain Brantz perhaps loses a little dignity but gains on the humorous side by his transformation into the character of McFuse. In the French piece Charles has been absent from home for twelve years; consequently we may reasonably expect him not to recognize his cousin Biribi, who hopes to marry Adolphine, cousin to both. Smith makes Charles' absence cover a period of only three years, and thus gives greater probability to his love for Charlotte. He also brings Billy Bowbell from London after Charles has enlisted; therefore, the cousins have never met.

In his first act Smith follows his model fairly closely in dialogue and entirely in plot and incidents. Charles rescues his commander from his predicament in the same manner. General Packenham requests an armistice for six hours, and for the same reason—to bury the dead.

In his second act Smith is more free in the rendering of his original, making those changes necessary to the time and place of his piece. Smith makes John Bull refuse to grind the corn for the English, his former countrymen; thereupon General Packenham orders Jackson, who is disguised in a miller's suit, to grind it. Jackson's equivocal replies to Packenham's questions must have delighted a patriotic audience. In this act the signing of the armistice is carried out in the same manner as in the original; but Charles is not allowed to return to the American lines with his commander. He is kept a prisoner and escapes from the burning mill as the curtain falls. Smith took his idea for the escape of Charles and the burning of the mill from the incidents in the third act of the French play.

The third act of *The Eighth of January* belongs to Smith alone. The first two acts of the French piece launched him fairly on

his story, and now in this short third act Smith allows himself the pleasure of praising Andrew Jackson, who had just been elected President.

This play occasioned an interesting piece of theatrical rivalry, which Durang records. "On the eighth of January, the Walnut Street house put forth a strong bill. . . . And, not to be behind the Chestnut Street Theatre, with their new national drama, Blake produced a dramatic sketch entitled *The Glorious Eighth of January*, written by a gentleman of Philadelphia. . . . It was a ludicrous battle of New Orleans."[5]

Smith's next play to appear upon the boards was another adaptation from the French. Wemyss, who produced the play, says it first appeared as *The Prodigals*, but that he rechristened it *The Disowned* to avail himself of the popularity of Bulwer's novel of that name. He also adds that the play was afterward produced in London,[6] but an examination of the various stage histories of England does not reveal a play by either title produced in this period. *The Disowned*, based upon a French drama, *Le Caissier*,[7] was first played at the Holliday Street Theatre, Baltimore, March 26, 1829.

The characters in the French drama are:

Bonneval, négociant de Paris.
Pauline, sa fille.
Bernard, riche armateur du Havre.
Gustave, son neveu.
Melfort, courtier-marron.
Amélie de Saint Ernest, jeune femme à la mode.
Thimer, mauvais sujet.
Justine, femme de chambre d'Amélie.
François, garçon de bureau de la maison Bonneval.
Un porteur de la banque.
Plusieurs dames et jeunes gens, amis de Gustave et d'Amélie.
La scène est à Paris.

---

[5] *The Philadelphia Stage*, Second Series, Chapter 46.

[6] *Twenty-six Years of the Life of an Actor and Manager*, Vol. 1, p. 171.

[7] *Le Caissier*, drame en trois actes, par Mm. Jouslin de la Salle et Saint Maurice; représenté pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le Théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, le 30 mars, 1826. Paris, 1826.

Melfort, a wicked broker of Paris, wishes to marry Pauline, daughter of the wealthy merchant Bonneval. As Gustave, the reckless nephew of Bernard, is the favored suitor, Melfort plans deliberately to ruin the young man. He has taught him to gamble and introduced him to the fascinating widow Amélie. His passion for gaming and his rich gifts to the fair widow have involved Gustave so heavily in debt that he has been led to embezzle the funds of his employer, Bonneval. When his uncle Bernard arrives to arrange for his wedding, Gustave's shortcomings are discovered. Happily, the young profligate is given an opportunity to redeem himself. The villainous Melfort has hired Thimer, a depraved brother of the good Amélie, to kill Bernard, who objects to the marriage of his nephew and Amélie; but Gustave, suspecting a foul plot, rushes into his uncle's chamber in time to save him from the murderous knife. The two villains are led away for punishment. Amélie renounces her lover and declares that they shall never meet again. Gustave is forgiven and Pauline is allowed to accept him for her husband.

Smith renames all but three of the characters, giving them French names, but more easily pronounceable. His model is full of idioms which make close translation difficult; Smith renders them freely and well. Though he follows his original closely in plot and incident, he cuts down scenes and abbreviates many rather tedious speeches. His only important change occurs in the last act. In the adaptation, Amelia, a woman much sinned against in both plays, saves the life of St. Felix (Bernard renamed) by interposing herself between him and the assassin. She receives the blow and dies on the stage. In the French piece Gustave saves his uncle's life without injury to himself. Both plays bring down the last curtain upon a moral injunction delivered by the villain to Gustavus.

In the preface to his play Smith states his reason for the change in the last act: "Many liberties have been taken with the original, in adapting it to the American stage, especially in the last act, where Bertrand kills his sister. In the French piece Amelia retires to a convent [it is not definitely so stated in the play], and Bertrand is taken into custody, the same hardened

wretch as he appears in the earlier scenes. The termination was without a climax, leaving a painful sensation on the mind of the spectator—for Amelia is still alive, and the man to whom she is so devotedly attached is given to another. Besides, a blemish is unnecessarily thrown upon the moral character of Amelia, which diminishes the interest awakened by her situation. The result proved the alteration to be judicious, and the powerful acting of Mr. Rowbotham [he acted Bertrand, Amelia's brother], after the death of Amelia, never failed to rivet the attention, and elicit the unqualified applause of the audience."

Undoubtedly, the change which Smith made in the last act was more satisfactory to the American audience of his time, as it would be to ours. Though in individual scenes the adaptation is more melodramatic than its original, this alteration removes it from that class of melodrama which requires a happy denouement. The French play is entitled a *drame* and almost justifies its title. It contains no *niais*, no startling turns in the action, and but few moralizing phrases. There is a long-lost brother and a murder frustrated under exaggerated circumstances, but in the main the play is nearer to drama than melodrama.

After the production of *A Wife at a Venture*, apparently an early effort in comedy, Smith's next borrowing from the French to be played was *The Sentinels; or, The Two Serge[a]nts*. Durang states that it was first presented at the Walnut Street Theatre in December, 1829, but he does not give the exact date of performance. He observes that "it was a very pretty drama, and was acted several times."[8]

This piece, an adaptation of *Les deux Sergents*, a very successful French melodrama,[9] was not printed. The manuscript is to be found in the Richard Penn Smith Collection of the Pennsylvania Historical Society, Philadelphia.

The characters in the French play are:

---

[8] *The Philadelphia Stage*, Second Series, Chapter 51.

[9] *Les deux Sergents*, mélodrame en trois actes, par M. D'Aubigny [Baudouin]; représenté, pour la première fois, sur le théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, le 20 fevrier, 1823. Paris, 1823.

Félix, Robert } sergents dans un des régiments de ligne employés au cordon sanitaire: Robert décoré, plus jeune que Félix.
Morazzi, adjudant-major au même régiment, étranger.
Gustave, jeune aspirant de marine.
Valentin, ancien militaire.
Mme. Derville, femme d'un ancien quartier-maître.
Adolphe, son fils.
Mme. Bertrand, sœur du concierge de la prison militaire de Porte-Vendre.
Laurette, sa nièce.

La scène se passe, le premier et le troisième acte à Porte-Vendre, le second dans l'île de Roses, à trois lieues de Porte-Vendre.

This is a Damon and Pythias story. The two sergeants, Robert and Félix, have performed an act of mercy by permitting a poor woman and her two children to cross the line drawn by the military against the infection of yellow fever. For this infraction the Council of War has decided that one of them must die. The dice are to decide their fate. Morazzi, the villain of the piece, hopes that Félix will win the throw, for Robert is his fortunate rival for the hand of Laurette. After a tense moment in which the dice favor Robert, Félix confides to his dear comrade that he has a wife and child living on the isle of Roses, just three leagues away. As the execution is to take place at four in the afternoon of the following day, Robert pleads with his friend that he visit his family once more and allow him to remain as hostage. Félix consents to pay a last visit to his family.

There is only one boat plying between the isle of Roses and Porte-Vendre. This vessel is commanded by young Gustave, whom Félix once saved from drowning. Gustave is now resolved to acquit himself of the debt. When Félix arrives on the island, he finds the inevitable fête; but this rejoicing is not for him. After a brief visit with his family, he asks Gustave to make ready to return. Instead of complying, the young commander gives a signal and the vessel appears in flames. Félix is in despair. On the morrow his friend must die for him.

It is three o'clock in the afternoon at the château of Porte-Vendre, the sea in the distance. All the preparations for the execution have been made. Robert, liberated on his word of honor, has married Laurette, who is blissfully unaware of his impending fate. As they return from the chapel, they see a squad of soldiers beside a newly-made grave. Laurette in fright rushes out to find the commanding officer. But it is four o'clock. Robert faces the firing squad. Just then a wave throws Félix ashore. He is brought forward exhausted. Laurette returns with a pardon for both. The General knows all and orders the arrest of Morazzi.

This is a melodrama of the poorer kind, full of *invraisemblances*. It was written by the author of the celebrated *Pie voleuse*, and enjoyed a success in France in marked contrast with that of its adaptation in America. Royer states: "La profonde sensation produite par le troisième acte de cet ouvrage fit oublier les absurdités sur lesquelles se base son action. . . . Le retour subit de Félix qui a fait la traversée à la nage pour tenir sa parole provoqua une explosion d'enthousiasme et plaça le mélodrame de Daubigny parmi les plus estimés de boulevard."[10] And Ginisty, referring to the happy denouement, says "C'était le sublime dans l'absurde."[11]

The Sentinels; or, The Two Serge[a]nts is Smith's most faithful translation to appear on the stage. At times it shows evidences of haste, especially in the too literal rendering of certain French expressions (even in a word in his title he follows the French spelling); but in the main his translation is good and idiomatic. Nevertheless, Smith does make several alterations, one of which might be noted. In the first act of the French piece, which was written in 1823, there is a good illustration of that tearful sentimentality so marked in the earlier period. When the two sergeants are touched with pity at the sad plight of the destitute mother and her two children, they regard "en silence ce tableau déchirant, et tous les deux entraînés par le même sentiment, nous nous précipitâmes dans les bras l'un de l'autre." Smith

---

[10] *Histoire Universelle du Théâtre*, Vol. 5, p. 375.
[11] *Le Mélodrame*, p. 135.

could not endure such powerful emotion. His two sergeants are more practical; they "with one accord run to aid the suppliants." In America the tearful age was passing.

Almost four years elapsed before the presentation of Smith's next adaptation. During that time he produced several plays on native themes, as well as his romantic tragedy, *Caius Marius*. This tragedy, probably Smith's greatest play, is unfortunately not preserved. *Is She a Brigand?*, which was first played at the Arch Street Theatre, Philadelphia, November 1, 1833, is an adaptation of a French comedy entitled *Clara Wendel*.[12]

The characters in the French comedy follow:

Le Colonel Hermann.
Clara, countess d'Albi.
M. Lindorf, bourgmestre.
Brigitte, gouvernante de Clara.
Malbotté, postillon.
Ketly, servante d'auberge.
Fribourg, valet de chambre du colonel.
Deux Invités à la noce.
Soldats, Villageois, Amie du colonel.
La scène est en Suisse.

The plot turns upon the old theme of mistaken identity. Clara, Countess d'Albi, has quarreled with her lover, Colonel Hermann. To test her love, the Colonel spreads the rumor of his approaching marriage. At this news the impulsive Clara decides upon vigorous measures; she must hasten to the château of Colonel Hermann to prevent the marriage. But she has failed to reckon with a stupid burgomaster, who detains her at a Swiss tavern, believing her to be the desperate brigand, Clara Wendel, who has been terrorizing the Swiss countryside. As any delay may prove fatal to her plans, the Countess admits that she is the notorious brigand and fabricates a wild tale to the effect that even now her robber band is on the way to pillage the château

[12] *Clara Wendel, ou la demoiselle brigand*, comédie-vaudeville en deux actes, de MM. Theaulon, Dartois et Francis; représenté, pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le Théâtre des Variétés, le 25 Janvier 1827. Paris, 1827.

of the Colonel. However, if the burgomaster will be so obliging as to conduct her to the château, she will help him to discover her partners in crime. The silly burgomaster believes her story and accompanies her with a posse. When Clara arrives at the château she finds that the nuptials are being prepared for her, and that the Colonel has adopted this unique method merely to put her love to the test. The burgomaster, somewhat chagrined, accepts the situation, averring that he was aware of Clara's identity from the first, and that he humored her plan of coming to the château with an escort.

Smith follows this two-act *comédie* in plot, incidents, and stage business, but his rendering is in free and vigorous English. He renames one character and adds Fritz, the tavern-keeper, who praises his hostelry with most absurd similes to augment the comic element. The adaptation is essentially more farcical. The original contains about one hundred lines to be sung; there are only two songs in Smith's version.

Is She a Brigand? was printed in Philadelphia in 1835. A newspaper clipping, which bears no date, is pasted on the first page of Smith's manuscript. It states that "The piece had a decided run upon the stage, a season or two since [probably 1833], and will be found of equal interest for perusal. It is now published for the first time."

Appendix A

A Comparison of the *Dramatis Personæ*

A comparison of the *dramatis personæ* of the original French pieces with their American adaptations:

APPENDIX A

Ali-Pacha	*Ali Pacha*
Ali-Thébélen, pacha de Janina	Ali Pacha
Sélim, petit-fils d'Ali	Selim
Xénocles, citoyen de Souli	Zenocles
Stephano, chef des troupes	Talathon
Mouctar, noir attaché à Ali	Mouctar
Zadir, soldat attaché à Selim	Hassan
Héléna, fille de Xénocles	Helena
Ismail, pacha général	
Zélidé, mère de Sélim	

Le Caissier	*The Disowned*
Bonneval, négociant de Paris	Duval
Pauline, sa fille	Pauline
Bernard, riche armateur	St. Felix
Gustave, son neveu	Gustavus St. Felix
Melfort	Malfort
Amélie de Saint Ernest	Amelia
Thimer, mauvais sujet	Bertrand
Justine, femme de chambre	Justine
François	Andrew

C'Etoit Moi	*'Twas I*
Mathurin, fermier	Delorme
Mathurine, sa femme	Madam Delorme
Justine, sa cousine	Georgette Clairville
Bastien, jardinier	Marcel Margot
Madame Bertrand, vieille voisine	Madam Mag
	Mayor
	Town Clerk
	Marchioness de Merivale

Clara Wendel, ou la demoiselle brigand	*Is She a Brigand?*
Le Colonel Hermann	Colonel Herman
Clara, Countess d'Albi	Clara, Countess d'Albi
M. Lindorf, bourgmestre	Lindorf
Brigitte, gouvernante de Clara	Bridget
Malbotté, postillon	Peter Schnapps
Ketly, servante d'auberge	Mariette
Fribourg, valet de chambre	Fribourg
Deux Invités	First Friend
	Second Friend

Clari, ou la Promesse de Mariage	*Clari*
Simeone, riche fermier	Rolamo
Simonetta, sa femme	Fidalma
Clari, leur fille	Clari
Le Duc Melvilla	Duke of Vivaldi
Germano, valet et confident de Duc	Jocoso
Betti, soubrette	Vespina
Matturino	Nicolo
Giuglietta, promise à Paolo	Ninetta
Paolo, prétendu de Giuglietta	Nimpedo
Le Podestat, père de Paolo	

Les deux Forçats	*Two Galley Slaves*
François, meunier	Henry
M. Deville, son oncle	Major de Lisle
Antoine Perrot, frère de Thérèse	Bonhomme
Thérèse, meunière	Louise
M. Martin, maître des postes	M. La Route
Un Inconnu	Unknown
Jean Lablanc, garçon meunier	Basil
Louis, fils de Thérèse	Felix

Les deux Sergents	*The Sentinels*
Felix } sergents	Felix
Robert }	Le Clair
Morazzi	Morazzi
Gustave	Gustavus
Valentin	Valentine
Mme. Derville	Mme. Derville
Adolphe	Adolph
Mme. Bertrand	Madame Bertrand
Laurette, sa nièce	Laurette

La Famille d'Anglade	*Accusation*
Adolphe d'Anglade	Adolphus d'Anglade
Lina de Senesse, son épouse	Madame d'Anglade
Alphonse, leur fils	Charles
Madame de Cerval, veuve	Madame de Cerval
D'Olsan, neveu de Mme. de Cerval	Valmore
Léon d'Assaudray	Leon de Valency
Bertaud, vieux domestique	Bertrand
René, valet de chambre	Hubert
Fourbin, intrigant	Fourbin
Marcel, jardinier	Marcel
Un Officier supérieur	Dorval
Dumont, bijoutier	Dumont

La Femme à deux maris	*The Wife of Two Husbands*
Édouard, comte de Fersen	Count Belflor
Élisa Werner, sa femme	Countess
Isidore Fritz, premier mari d'Élisa	Isidore Fritz
Le Major de Goltz, oncle d'Édouard	Major Goltz
Jules, fils de Fritz et Élisa	Theodore
Werner, père d'Élisa	Baron Werner
M. Brown, chapelain	Rinaldo
Gertrude	Lilla
Bataille, caporal invalide	Armagh
Walter, compagnon de Fritz	Walter

La Forêt périlleuse ou les Brigands de la Calabre	*Rudolph; or, The Robbers of Calabria*
Colisan, jeune officier	Count Albert
Camille, amante de Colisan	Paulo
Fresco, valet de Colisan	Rosolia di Borgia
Le Capitaine des voleurs	Rudolph
Morgano, Piremont, L'Ardent } voleurs	Morgan, Alfiro, Barnardo

Le Frère Philippe	*Nature and Philosophy*
Frère Philippe	Father Philip
Lubin, son fils	Colin
Anselme, ami du Frère Philippe	Ronaldo
Élisa, fille d'Anselme	Eliza
Gertrude, gouvernante d'Élisa	Gertrude

Jérome Pointu	*Tell Truth and Shame the Devil*
Jérome Pointu, Procureur	Semblance
Léandre, Maître-Clerc	Tom Holton
Blaise, clerc de Normandie	
Jeanette, cuisinière	Susan
	Whitely

La Jeunesse de Henri V	*Charles the Second*
Henri, héritier présomptif	Charles II
Rochester, favori du prince	Rochester
Édouard, page du prince	Edward
Copp, capitaine de corsaire	Captain Copp
Miladi Clara, favorite	Lady Clara
Betty, nièce de Copp	Mary
William, valet de chambre	

La Jeunesse du Duc de Richelieu	*Richelieu*
Le Duc de Richelieu	Duke of Richelieu
Armand, son secrétaire	Dubois
M. Michelin, marchand de meubles	Dorival
Mme. Michelin, son épouse	Madam Dorival
Mme. Renaud, veuve d'un bourgeois	Countess Fleury
Marie, vieille cuisinière	Janet
La Fosse, valet de chambre	Lamotte
Un Laquais	Lacquey

Le Jugement de Salomon	*The Voice of Nature*
Salomon, roi d'Israël	Alphonso, king of Sicily
Azélie, princesse d'Égypte	Clarinda
Éliphal, frère de Salomon	Rinaldo
Gareb, ancien officier	Pedro
Tamira, veuve de Banaïas	Alzaira
Un Enfant de trois ans	Child

Léila, jeune villageoise	Lilla
Débora, vieille nourrice	Benedetta
Morad, jardinier	Vasquez
Zabel, gouvernante de l'enfant	Isabella

Mahomet II, ou les Captifs Vénitiens	*The Grecian Captive*
Mahomet deux, Empereur des Turcs	Ali Pacha
Paul Éritzo, Provéditeur	Kiminski
Anna Éritzo, fille du Provéditeur	Zelia
Bellini, jeune peintre vénitien	Demetrius Ypsilanti
Roberti, esclave vénitien	Roberto
Achmet, Aga des Janissaries	Achmet
Osmin, Nadir } officiers	Osmin, Nadir
Un Officier	Officer
	Alexander Ypsilanti
	Burrows, American

Le Maréchal de Luxembourg	*The Eighth of January*
Henri de Bouteville, Maréchal de Luxembourg	General Jackson
Le Comte de Saarbourg, Général des alliés	Sir Edward Packenham
Mildem, meunier de Harberg	John Bull
Charles, fils de Mildem	Charles, his son
Biribi, neveu de Mildem	Billy Bowbell
Adolphine, nièce de Mildem	Charlotte
Brantz, capitaine des troupes alliés	McFuse
Fonville, colonel français	Colonel Kemper
Werther, colonel des alliés	Colonel Thornton

Michel et Christine	*Love in Humble Life*
Stanislas, soldat	Ronslaus
Christine, jeune aubergiste	Christine
Michel, son cousin	Carlitz
Guillaume, garçon d'auberge	Brandt

Le Pélerin blanc	*The Wandering Boys*
Le comte de Castelli	Count de Croissy
La baronne de Castelli, nièce du comte	The Baroness
Paul, Justin } enfans abandonnés	Paul, Justin

Roland, intendant	Roland
Gervais, notable du hameau d'Olival	Hubert
Marceline, fermière d'Olival	Marceline
Jacquinet, neveu de Gervais	Lubin
Louise, fille de Marceline	Louise
Un Garde	Sentinel
	Gregoire
	Gaspard

Thérèse, ou l'Orpheline de Genève	*Therese*
Mme. de Sénange	Countess de Morville
Charles de Sénange, fils	Count de Morville
Thérèse, orpheline	Therese
Égerthon, ministre	Fontaine
Valther, Génevois	Carwin
Picard, ancien intendant	Picard
Mathurin, fermier	Lavigne
Brigite, femme de Mathurin	Bridget
Nanette, servante	Nannette
Le Magistrat	Delparc

Trente Ans, ou la Vie d'un Joueur	*Thirty Years; or, The Life of a Gamester*
M. de Germany, vieillard infirme	St. Germain
Georges de Germany, fils	George St. Germain
Warner, ami de Georges	Warner
Dermont, négociant-armateur	Dermont
Rodolphe	Rodolphe
Amélie, riche orpheline	Amelia

Valentine, ou la Séduction	*Adeline*
Le Comte de Noralberg	Prince Durstein
Édouard, son fils	Count Wilhelm
La Comtesse Honora, sa bru	Countess Blanche
Le Baron Ernest	Baron Remberg
Albert, vieil invalide, aveugle	Dorlin
Valentine, sa fille	Adeline
Mme. Germain	
Léonard, jardinier	Kertzler
Guillaume, valet de chambre	Gratz
Un Domestique	Albin

La Veuve du Malabar ou l'Empire des Coutumes	*The Widow of Malabar*
Lanassa, veuve du Malabar	Lanissa
Fatime	Fatima, her friend
Le Grand Bramin	High Priest of Bramins
Le jeune Bramin	Young Bramin
Un Bramin	A Bramin
Le Général français	French General
Un Officier	French Officer
Un Officier indien	Officer of Governor

APPENDIX B

Bibliography

General Reference

Bruce, H. L., *Voltaire on the English Stage* in *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, Vol. 8, 1918.

Brunet, Charles, *Table des pièces de théâtre décrites dans le catalogue de la bibliothèque de M. de Soleinne.* Paris, 1914.

Coad, O. S., *William Dunlap, a Study of His Life and Works and of His Place in Contemporary Culture* in Dunlap Society Publications, Series 3, Vol. 2. New York, 1917.

Dunlap, William, *History of the American Theatre.* New York, 1832.

Durang, Charles, *The Philadelphia Stage. From the Year 1749 to the Year 1855. Partly compiled from the papers of his father, the late John Durang; with notes by the editors* [of the Philadelphia *Sunday Despatch*]. Published serially as follows: First Series, 1749–1821, beginning in the issue of May 7, 1854; Second Series, 1822–1830, beginning June 29, 1856; Third Series, 1830–31–1855, beginning July 8, 1860.

Fouquier, A., *Causes Célèbres*, 6 Vols. Paris, 1858–1864.

Gaiffe, F., *Le Drame en France au XVIIIe Siècle.* Paris, 1910.

Genest, J., *Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830*, 10 Vols.. Bath, 1832.

Ginisty, P., *Le Mélodrame.* Paris, n. d. [1910].

Harrison, Gabriel, *John Howard Payne.* Revised Edition, Philadelphia, 1885.

Hartog, W. G., *Guilbert de Pixerécourt.* Paris, 1913.

Ireland, J. N., *Records of the New York Stage from 1750 to 1860*, 2 Vols. New York, 1866–1867.

Lanson, G., *Nivelle de la Chaussée et la Comédie larmoyante.* Paris, 1903.

Lenient, C., *La Comédie en France au XIXe Siècle*, 2 Vols. Paris, 1898.

McCullough, Bruce W., *The Life and Writings of Richard Penn Smith, with a Reprint of his play, "The Deformed," 1830.* Menasha, Wisconsin, 1917 (University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. Thesis).

Quinn, Arthur Hobson, *A History of the American Drama from the Beginning to the Civil War.* New York, 1923.

Rabany, Charles, *Kotzebue: sa vie et son temps.* Paris, 1893.

Royer, A., *Histoire Universelle du Théâtre*, 6 Vols. Paris, 1869.

Seilhamer, G. O., *History of the American Theatre*, 3 Vols. Philadelphia, 1888–1891.

Sellier, W., *Kotzebue in England.* (University of Leipzig Ph.D. Thesis.) Leipzig, 1901.
Thorndike, A. H., *Tragedy.* New York, 1908.
Wegelin, O., *Early American Plays.* New York, 1905.
Wemyss, Francis C., *Twenty-six Years of the Life of an Actor and Manager,* 2 Vols. New York, 1847.
Wood, W. B., *Personal Recollections of the Stage.* Philadelphia, 1855.

Adaptations of French Plays

The place and date of first production are given in parentheses.

Anonymous Plays:

Nature and Philosophy. Richmond, 1821. (Park Theater, New York, December 10, 1821.)

Sylla. New York, 1827. (Chatham Theater, New York, January 15, 1827.)

William Dunlap:

Tell Truth and Shame the Devil. New York, 1797. (John Street Theater, New York, January 9, 1797.)

Thirty Years; or, The Life of a Gamester. Ms. in the Yale University Library. (Bowery Theater, New York, February 22, 1828.)

The Voice of Nature. New York, 1803. (Park Theater, New York, February 4, 1803.)

The Wife of Two Husbands. New York, 1804. (Park Theater, New York, April 4, 1804.)

David Humphreys:

The Widow of Malabar; or, The Tyranny of Custom. In *Miscellaneous Works,* Philadelphia, 1790. (Southwark Theater, Philadelphia, May 7, 1790.)

M. M. Noah:

The Grecian Captive; or, The Fall of Athens. New York, 1822. (Park Theater, New York, June 17, 1822.)

The Wandering Boys; or, The Castle of Olival. Boston, 1821. (Charleston, 1812, as *Paul and Alexis;* Covent Garden, London, February 24, 1814; Park Theater, New York, March 16, 1820.)

John Howard Payne:

Accusation; or, The Family of D'Anglade. London, 1817. (Drury Lane Theatre, London, February 1, 1816; Park Theatre, New York, May 10, 1816.)

Adeline, the Victim of Seduction. London, 1822. (Drury Lane Theatre, London, February 9, 1822; Park Theatre, New York, May 1, 1822.)

Ali Pacha; or, The Signet-Ring. New York, 1823. (Covent Garden, London, October 19, 1822; Park Theatre, New York, May 8, 1823.)

Brutus; or, The Fall of Tarquin. London, 1818. (Drury Lane Theatre, London, December 3, 1818; Park Theatre, New York, March 15, 1819.)

Charles the Second; or, The Merry Monarch. London, 1824. (Covent Garden, London, May 27, 1824; Park Theatre, New York, October 25, 1824.)

Clari; or, The Maid of Milan. London, 1823. (Covent Garden, London, May 8, 1823; Park Theatre, New York, November 12, 1823.)

Love in Humble Life. London, n. d. (Drury Lane Theatre, London, February 14, 1822; Franklin Theatre, New York, July 25, 1837.)

Peter Smink; or, The Armistice. London, n. d. [1822?]. (Royal Surrey Theatre, London, July 8, 1822; Park Theatre, New York, October 14, 1826.)

Richelieu: a Domestic Tragedy. New York, 1826. (Covent Garden, London, February 11, 1826; Chestnut Street Theatre, Philadelphia, 1829.)

Therese, the Orphan of Geneva. London, 1821. (Drury Lane Theatre, London, February 2, 1821; Anthony Street Theatre, New York, April 30, 1821.)

'Twas I; or, The Truth a Lie. New York, 1827. (Covent Garden, London, December 3, 1825; Park Theatre, New York, May 20, 1826.)

The Two Galley Slaves; or, The Mill of St. Aldervon. London, n. d. (Covent Garden, London, November 6, 1822; Park Theatre, New York, October 27, 1823.)

Richard Penn Smith:

The Disowned; or, The Prodigals. Philadelphia, 1830. (Holliday Street Theatre, Baltimore, March 26, 1829.)

The Eighth of January. Philadelphia, 1829. (Chestnut Street Theatre, Philadelphia, January 8, 1829.)

Is She a Brigand?. Philadelphia, 1835. (Arch Street Theatre, Philadelphia, November 1, 1833.)

The Sentinels; or, The Two Serge[a]nts. Ms. in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. (Walnut Street Theatre, Philadelphia, December, 1829.)

John D. Turnbull:

Rudolph; or, The Robbers of Calabria. Boston, 1807. (Boston Theatre, May 13, 1807.)

The Original French Pieces

The place and date of first production are given in parentheses.

Abbé de l'Épée, drame en cinq actes by Jean Nicolas Bouilly. In *Suite du Répertoire du Théâtre Français,* Paris, 1823. (Théâtre Français, Paris, December 14, 1799.)

Ali-Pacha, mélodrame en trois actes by Hyacinthe [François Isaac Hyacinthe de Comberousse], and Alfred [Michel Pichat]. Paris, 1822. (Théâtre du Panorama Dramatique, Paris, July 9, 1822.) See Payne's *Ali Pacha; or, The Signet Ring.*

Brutus by Voltaire [François Marie Arouet de]. In *Œuvres Complètes* de Voltaire, Paris, 1828. (Théâtre Français, Paris, December 11, 1730.) See Payne's *Brutus; or, The Fall of Tarquin.*

Le Caissier, drame en trois actes by Jouslin de la Salle and Saint Maurice. Paris, 1826. (Théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, Paris, March 30, 1826.) See Smith's *The Disowned; or, The Prodigals.*

C'Etoit Moi, comédie en un acte by Boursault [Jean François dit Malherbe]. Paris, 1807. (Théâtre des Variétés Étrangères, Paris, May 25, 1807.) See Payne's *'Twas I; or, The Truth a Lie.*

Clara Wendel, ou la demoiselle brigand, comédie-vaudeville en deux actes by Theaulon, Dartois, and Francis. Paris, 1827. (Théâtre des Variétés, Paris, January 25, 1827.) See Smith's *Is She a Brigand?.*

Clari, ou la Promesse de Mariage, Ballet-Pantomime en trois actes by L. J. Milon. Paris, 1820. (Théâtre de l'Académie Royale de Musique, Paris, June 19, 1820.) See Payne's *Clari; or, The Maid of Milan.*

Clémentine et Désormes, drame en cinq actes by Monvel [Jacques Marie Boutet de]. Paris, 1785. (Théâtre Français, Paris, December 14, 1780.)

Les deux Forçats, ou la Meunière du Puy-de-Dôme, mélodrame en trois actes by Boirie, Carmouche, and Poujol. In *Chefs-d'Œuvre du Répertoire des Mélodrames.* Paris, 1825. (Théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, Paris, October 3, 1822.) See Payne's *The Two Galley Slaves.*

Les deux Sergents, mélodrame en trois actes by D'Aubigny [Baudouin]. Paris, 1823. (Théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, Paris, February 20, 1823.) See Smith's *The Sentinels; or, The Two Serge[a]nts.*

La Famille d'Anglade, ou le Vol, mélodrame en trois actes by Fournier and Frédéric [du Petit-Méré]. Paris, 1816. (Théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, Paris, January 11, 1816.) See Payne's *Accusation; or, The Family of D'Anglade.*

La Femme à deux maris, mélodrame en trois actes by Guilbert-Pixerécourt. Paris, 1802. (Théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique, Paris, September 14, 1802.) See Dunlap's *The Wife of Two Husbands.*

La Forêt périlleuse ou les Brigands de la Calabre: drame en trois actes by J. M. Loaisel-Tréogate. Paris, 1798. (Théâtre de la Cité, Paris, May 17, 1797.) See Turnbull's *Rudolph; or, The Robbers of Calabria.*

Le Frère Philippe, opéra-comique en un acte by Auguste Duport. Paris, 1818. (Théâtre Royal de l'Opéra Comique, Paris, January 20, 1818.) See *Nature and Philosophy.*

Jérome Pointu, comédie en un acte by Beaunoir [A. L. B. Robineau]. Paris, 1782. (Théâtre des Variétés Amusantes, Paris, June 13, 1781.) See Dunlap's *Tell Truth and Shame the Devil.*

La Jeunesse de Henri V, comédie en trois actes by Alexandre Duval. In *Suite du Répertoire du Théâtre Français.* Paris, 1823. (Théâtre Français, Paris, June 9, 1806.) See Payne's *Charles the Second.*

La Jeunesse du Duc de Richelieu ou le Lovelace Français, drame en cinq actes by A. Duval and Monvel [Jacques Marie Boutet de]. In *Suite du Répertoire du Théâtre Français.* Paris, 1823. (Théâtre Français, Paris, December, 1796.) See Payne's *Richelieu.*

Le Jugement de Salomon, mélodrame en trois actes by L. C. Caigniez. Paris, 1802. (Théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique, Paris, January 18, 1802.) See Dunlap's *The Voice of Nature.*

Mahomet II, ou les Captifs vénitiens, drame heroïque en trois actes by Charrin [Pierre Joseph], and Joseph [François Nicolas Dusaulchoy de Bergemont]. Paris, 1820. (Paris, 1820.) See Noah's *The Grecian Captive.*

Le Maréchal de Luxembourg, mélodrame en trois actes by Frédéric [du Petit-Méré], and Boirie. Paris, 1812. (Théâtre de la Gaîté, Paris, September 26, 1812.) See Smith's *Eighth of January.*

Michel et Christine, comédie-vaudeville en un acte by Eugène Scribe. In *Œuvres Choisies de E. Scribe.* Paris, 1845. (Théâtre Gymnase Dramatique, Paris, December 3, 1821.) See Payne's *Love in Humble Life.*

Nina, ou la Folle par Amour, comédie en un acte, en prose, melée d'ariettes by Marsollier. Paris, 1786. (Paris, May 15, 1786.)

Le Pélerin blanc, drame en trois actes by R. C. Guilbert-Pixerécourt. Paris, 1802. (Théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique, Paris, April 6, 1801.) See Noah's *Wandering Boys; or, The Castle of Olival.*

Sylla, tragédie en cinq actes by Etienne, Victor Joseph de Jouy. Paris, 1821. (Théâtre Français, Paris, December 27, 1821.)

Thérèse, ou l'Orpheline de Genève, mélodrame en trois actes by Victor [Ducange]. In *Chefs d'Œuvre du Répertoire des Mélodrames.* Paris, 1825. (Théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique, Paris, November 23, 1820.) See Payne's *Therese, the Orphan of Geneva.*

Trente Ans, ou la Vie d'un Joueur, mélodrame en trois journées by Victor Ducange and Dinaux [Prosper Goubaux]. Paris, 1829. (Théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, Paris, June 19, 1827.) See Dunlap's *Thirty Years; or, The Life of a Gamester.*

Valentine, ou la Séduction, mélodrame en trois actes by Guilbert-Pixerécourt. Paris, 1822. (Théâtre de la Gaîté, Paris, December 13, 1821.) See Payne's *Adeline.*

La Veuve du Malabar ou l'Empire des Coutumes, tragédie en cinq actes by Lemierre [Antoine Marin]. Paris, 1803. (Théâtre Français, Paris, 1770.) See Humphreys' *The Widow of Malabar.*

INDEX

Barker, J. N., 8, 74
Bishop, H. R., 53
Boirie, 47, 51, 74
Bouilly, J. N., 19, 21
Boursault, 64
Caigniez, L. C., 21
Charrin, 69
Coad, O. S., 18, 21
Cobb, James, 25, 27
Daubigny, 35, 81
Ducange, V., 40, 41, 71
Ducray-Duminil, 32
Duncombe, Wm., 39, 40
Dunlap, Wm., 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 71
Duport, Auguste, 67
Durang, C., 75, 79
Duval, A., 57, 58, 60, 61, 63
Frédéric, 36, 47, 74
Gaiffe, F., 17, 18, 53
Genest, J., 14, 19, 23, 25, 36, 40, 45, 47, 51, 60, 64
Ginisty, P., 21, 24, 25, 35, 41, 83
Gunning, Elizabeth, 25, 27
Harrison, G., 41, 55
Hartog, W., 32, 45, 56
Henry, John, 12, 18
Humphreys, D., 8, 12, 13, 14, 15
Hyacinthe de Comberousse, 48
Irving, Washington, 60
Jouslin de la Salle, 79
Jouy, E., 66
Kemble, C., 48, 61
Kerr, John, 31
Kotzebue, A., 8, 10, 19, 31, 66
Lanoue, 71
Lanson, G., 28
Lemierre, 12, 13, 14
Lenient, C., 46 57, 61
Loaisel-Tréogate, 29
Marmontel, 53, 54
Marsollier, 28, 32
Mercier, J. S., 17, 57
Miller, J., 66
Milon, L. J., 55, 56
Monvel, 18, 61
Noah, M. M., 9, 27, 31, 33, 67, 69, 70, 71
Payne, J. H., 9, 10, 27, 29, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65, 66, 67, 70, 77
Pixerécourt, G., 10, 25, 27, 31, 32, 43, 44, 45, 50, 67
Quinn, A. H., 13, 16, 32, 36, 39, 40, 61, 74,
Robineau, A. L. B., 15
Royer, A., 10, 35, 83
Scribe, E., 46
Smith, R. P., 9, 10, 27, 47, 67, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85
Stark, Mariana, 14
Theaulon, 84
Turnbull, J. D., 9, 29, 30
Voltaire, 39, 40, 66
Wemyss, F. C., 79

PRINTED BY
WESTBROOK PUBLISHING CO.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.